LIBRARY OF PRINCETON
JAN 3 1931
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

BV 660 .L6
Lockton, William.
Divers orders of ministers

DIVERS ORDERS OF MINISTERS

By the same Author :

THE THREE TRADITIONS IN THE GOSPELS

Crown 8vo. 7*s.* 6*d. net.*

'A book of extraordinary originality and of real learning.'—*The Church Quarterly Review.*

CERTAIN ALLEGED GOSPEL SOURCES

A STUDY OF Q, PROTO-LUKE AND M

Crown 8vo. 3*s.* 6*d. net.*

'This small but weighty essay . . . worthy of careful consideration by all students of the Synoptic problem.'—*The Church Times.*

In Preparation

ST. JOHN'S GOSPEL

As First Edited.

DIVERS ORDERS OF MINISTERS

LIBRARY OF PRINCETON
JAN 3 1931
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

AN INQUIRY INTO THE ORIGINS AND
EARLY HISTORY OF THE MINISTRY OF
THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH

BY

W. LOCKTON, B.D.

VICE-PRINCIPAL OF WINCHESTER DIOCESAN TRAINING
COLLEGE

LONGMANS, GREEN AND CO.
LONDON · NEW YORK · TORONTO
1930

LONGMANS, GREEN AND CO. LTD.
39 PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON, E.C. 4
6 OLD COURT HOUSE STREET, CALCUTTA
53 NICOL ROAD, BOMBAY
36A MOUNT ROAD, MADRAS

LONGMANS, GREEN AND CO.
55 FIFTH AVENUE, NEW YORK
221 EAST 20TH STREET, CHICAGO
TREMONT TEMPLE, BOSTON
128–132 UNIVERSITY AVENUE, TORONTO

Made in Great Britain

PREFACE

An apology is perhaps needed for adding another to the many books on the ministry of the Christian Church. The only excuse possible is a claim that it contains something not to be found in any of its predecessors. The writer hopes that this is not altogether untrue in the present instance, and that the essay puts forward many considerations not previously adduced. Indeed, whatever its merits otherwise, it is claimed that it gives in many ways a quite original view of the origins of the Christian ministry, which solves numerous problems, and it is hoped will prove to be not without value for the many discussions imminent at the present time.

He would like to express his indebtedness to the many earlier works on the same subject, and particularly to Dr. Gore's 'The Church and the Ministry' (Longmans, Green & Co.). As a rule the translations of the many passages from ancient writers quoted are not original, though in many places for the sake of the argument, or other reasons, it has been necessary, or desirable, to make alterations in the translation employed. For renderings of Jewish documents he is largely dependent on those published by S.P.C.K.: Danby's 'Sanhedrin,' Lukyn-Williams' 'Berakoth,' Oesterley's 'Pirke Aboth,' Greenup's 'Sukkah,' Levertoff's 'Midrash Sifre' on Numbers. He has also used Cohen's Babylonian 'Berakoth' (Cambridge University Press), Rodkinson's great translation of the Babylonian Talmud (New Talmud Publishing Company, Boston, U.S.A.), Friedlander's ' Pirke de Rabbi Eliezer ' (Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co.), and Danby's rendering of an extract from ' Shabbath,' given in Klausner's Jesus of Nazareth ' (George Allen & Unwin, and The Macmillan Company, New York). Much information was also found in the well-known works of John Lightfoot, Edersheim and Shürer. Whiston's translation of Josephus has commonly been used. For early Christian writers he is under obligation to Taylor's ' Teaching of the Apostles ' (Deighton, Bell & Co.), Charles's ' Ascension of Isaiah ' (S.P.C.K.), Lightfoot's ' Apostolic Fathers ' for the works of Clement of Rome, Ignatius, Polycarp and Hermas (Macmillan & Co.), Keble's ' Irenæus ' (Parker & Co.), Robinson's ' Apostolic Preaching ' of Irenæus (S.P.C.K.), Jackson's ' Theodoret,' Fremantle's ' Jerome,' Percival's ' Canons of the Œcumenical Councils ' (Parker & Co.), and Lawton and Oulton's ' Eusebius ' (S.P.C.K.), each used in varying degrees. To all these, or their representatives, and their publishers, the writer wishes to express his thanks for permission generously given to make quotations, with apologies for any alterations he has been constrained to make for the purposes of the essay. Lastly, he desires to thank the University Presses of Oxford and Cambridge for permission kindly given to quote from the Revised Version of the Bible where required, and he accepts entire responsibility for all deviations from it. Sometimes it has been necessary, to bring out a particular point, to make another translation, and sometimes to give a translation of the Septuagint.

Whenever possible the reader is advised to have copies of the original texts before him, full references being given. Otherwise the argument will necessarily be somewhat incomplete.

W. Lockton.

Easter Even,
April 19, 1930.

CONTENTS

PART I

UNDER THE OLD COVENANT

CHAPTER PAGE
Prologue 1
I. High Priest and Prophet . . . 3
II. The Elders of the Great Sanhedrin . 11
III. The Elders of the Lesser Sanhedrins 22
IV. The Rulers of the Synagogues . . 28
V. The Disciples of the Wise . . . 31
VI. The Authority of the Metropolis . 37
VII. The Tradition of the Shekinah . . 45

PART II

IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

I. The Organisation of the New Kingdom of God 54
II. The Spirit and the New Organisation . 73
III. The Order of Deacons . . . 89
IV. The Order of Elders 95
V. The Ministry outside Jerusalem . 103

CHAPTER PAGE
VI. THE COUNCIL OF JERUSALEM . . . 110
VII. THE MINISTRY IN THE PASTORAL EPISTLES 116
VIII. OTHER EPISTLES OF ST. PAUL . . 121
IX. THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS . . 131
X. THE FIRST EPISTLE OF ST. PETER . . 135
XI. THE EPISTLES OF ST. JOHN . . . 141
XII. THE APOCALYPSE OF ST. JOHN . . 143

PART III

IN THE EARLY CHURCH

I. THE DIDACHE 147
II. THE EPISTLE OF CLEMENT . . . 161
III. THE 'SHEPHERD' OF HERMAS . . . 176
IV. PAPIAS, HEGESIPPUS AND POLYCRATES:
  I. PAPIAS 183
  II. HEGESIPPUS 185
  III. POLYCRATES 189
V. THE EPISTLES OF IGNATIUS . . . 192
VI. POLYCARP 207
VII. IRENÆUS 214
VIII. METROPOLITICAL CHURCHES:
  I. ROME 224
  II. ALEXANDRIA 243
  III. ANTIOCH 245
EPILOGUE 251

DIVERS ORDERS OF MINISTERS

PART I

UNDER THE OLD COVENANT

PROLOGUE

'It is evident unto all men diligently reading holy Scripture and ancient Authors, that from the Apostles' time there have been these Orders of Ministers in Christ's Church; Bishops, Priests, and Deacons.' So begins the Preface to 'The form and manner of making, ordaining, and consecrating of bishops, priests, and deacons, according to the order of the Church of England,' in the Book of Common Prayer. Is the statement true? At every period in the history of the English church since it was first published in 1550 there have been men, either inside or outside the church, who have denied its truth, and never have they been more numerous, or more insistent in their negations than to-day. It may be well, therefore, to examine afresh the whole question from the beginning, if possible from a new point of view.

What was the scheme of organisation of the Christian church in its earliest days, in the time of the Apostles? If we are to answer this question, we must first of all have a clear grasp of the organisation of the Jewish church in the time of our Lord. It is only in the light of knowledge of the organisation of the people of God under the old covenant that we can understand the significance of the different ranks of ministers in that of the new people of God under the new covenant.

For our inquiry we have three chief sources of information : the books of the Old and New Testaments with the Apocrypha, the writings of Josephus, and the tractates of the Talmud. The last can be used only with caution, for on many points the information given is true only of the period after the fall of Jerusalem, when the centre of the Jewish church was elsewhere than at Jerusalem. Critical views of the Old and New Testaments are not without their value, but we have to remember that the interpretations of passages of the Old Testament, which were regarded as authoritative by both Jewish and Christian writers, were not necessarily those of twentieth-century critics, even on points where there can be little doubt but that modern scholars are correct.

CHAPTER I

HIGH PRIEST AND PROPHET

WE will begin our inquiry with an extract from Josephus: 'Let there be seven men to act as magistrates in each city, men exercised already both in virtue and in zeal for righteousness; and to each magistracy let two men of the tribe of Levi be assigned as officers. And let those that are chosen to judge in the cities be held in the highest honour . . . for justice is the power of God. . . . But if these judges know not how to decide on matters submitted to them . . . let them send up the case undetermined to the holy city, and there let the high priest and the prophet and the senate come together, and decide what seems good to them.' [1]

It will be useful to consider the last words first. The reference to 'the high priest and the prophet' has given rise to considerable discussion, and some have supposed that a duumvirate, of which however there is no other real evidence, is intended, and a lay assessor to the high priest is postulated, 'the judge' as well as 'the priest' being mentioned in Deuteronomy (xvii. 9, 12). Rather, it would seem, the high priest is himself the prophet. He is mentioned in his double capacity. The prophetic office was, indeed, the primary office of the Jewish high priest. The special prerogative of the priesthood was the possession of the Urim and Thummim. In the blessing of Moses we read, 'And of Levi he said, Thy Thummim and thy Urim are with thy godly one. . . . They shall teach Jacob thy judgements, and Israel thy law' (Deut. xxxiii. 8, 10). Of Joshua it is said, 'He shall stand before Eleazar the priest, who shall inquire for him by the judgement of the Urim before the Lord: at his word shall they go out, and at his word they shall come in, both he, and all the children of Israel with him, even all the congregation' (Num. xxvii. 21). The clearest example of the use of Urim and Thummim is to be found in the story of Saul who asked counsel of God by the priest Ahijah. The Hebrew text has been mutilated, but in Lucian's recension we read, 'And Saul said, O Lord, the God of Israel, why hast thou not answered thy servant this day? If the iniquity be in me or in Jonathan my son, give Urim; and if thou sayest thus: The iniquity is in the people, give Thummim. And the lot fell upon Saul and Jonathan, and the people escaped. And Saul said: Cast the lot between me and Jonathan my son, and on whomsoever the Lord shall cause the lot to fall, let him die' (I. Sam. xiv. 41–42).

---

[1] *Ant.* IV. viii. 14.

The use of Urim and Thummim was akin to the method of casting the lot which was employed when the land was divided among the tribes, Joshua and Eleazar acting together. 'And these are the inheritances which the children of Israel took in the land of Canaan, which Eleazar the priest, and Joshua the son of Nun, and the heads of the fathers' houses of the tribes of the children of Israel, distributed unto them, by the lot of their inheritance, as the Lord commanded by the hand of Moses' (Jos. xiv. 1–2). The same method of the lot was used when the twenty-four courses of priests were arranged. 'And the courses of the sons of Aaron were these. The sons of Aaron; Nadab and Abihu, Eleazar and Ithamar. . . . Of the sons of Eleazar there were sixteen, heads of fathers' houses; and of the sons of Ithamar, according to their fathers' houses, eight. Thus were they divided by lot, ne sort with another' (I. Chron. xxiv. 1, 4–5). According to the Talmud the same method was adopted when the four courses which returned from the captivity were divided into twenty-four. 'Four courses of service came back from the exile, namely, Jedaiah, Harim, Pashur, and Immer. . . . Then the prophets that were among them arose and made twenty-four lots, and put them into an urn. And Jedaiah came and drew five lots. . . .'[1] We notice that those in charge of the lot are called prophets.

At one time we are told God refused to answer by the sacred lot. 'And when Saul inquired of the Lord, the Lord answered him not, neither by dreams, nor by Urim, nor by prophets' (I. Sam. xxviii. 6). The use of Urim and Thummim was an official act of prophecy limited to the high priest. After the captivity Urim and Thummim were among the things absent from the second temple, so that the fulness of the high priestly office was impaired. We read in Ezra (ii. 63), and also in Nehemiah (vii. 65), 'And the Tirshatha said unto them, that they should not eat of the most holy things, till there stood up a priest with Urim and with Thummim' (cf. I. Esd. v. 40). In the first book of the Maccabees instead of the high priest with Urim and Thummim we read of his equivalent the prophet. 'And they pulled down the altar, and laid up the stones in the mountain of the house in a convenient place, until there should come a prophet to give an answer concerning them' (iv. 45–46). 'The Jews and the priests were well pleased that Simon should be their leader and high priest for ever, until there should arise a faithful prophet' (xiv. 41).

The high priest with Urim and Thummim is a prophet. Yet the word has a wider significance. We carry our thoughts back to a period before the institution of the Aaronic priesthood. 'The Lord thy God will raise up unto thee a prophet from the midst of thee, of thy brethren, like unto me; unto him ye shall hearken' (Deut. xviii. 15). Moses was a prophet and more than a prophet. ‘If there be a prophet among you, I the Lord will make myself known unto him in a vision, I will speak with him in a dream. My servant Moses is not so; he is faithful in all mine house: with him will I speak mouth to mouth, even manifestly, and not in dark speeches; and the form of the Lord shall he behold’ (Num. xii. 6–8). ‘Now Moses used to take the tent and to pitch it without the camp, afar off from the camp; and he called it, The tent of meeting. And it came to pass, that every one which sought the Lord went out unto the tent of meeting, which was without the camp. . . . And it came to pass, when Moses entered into the tent, the pillar of cloud descended, and stood at the door of the tent, and the Lord spake with Moses. . . . And the Lord spake unto Moses face to face, as a man speaketh unto his friend’ (Exod. xxxiii. 7, 9, 11). The glory before the Lord is identical with the glory of mount Sinai. ‘And it came to pass, when Moses came down from mount Sinai with the two tables of the testimony in Moses’ hand, when he came down from the mount, that Moses wist not that the skin of his face sent forth beams by reason of his speaking with him. And when Aaron and all the children of Israel saw Moses, behold, the skin of his face sent forth beams; and they were afraid to come nigh him. . . . And when Moses had done speaking with them, he put a veil on his face. But when Moses went in before the Lord to speak with him, he took the veil off, until he came out; and he came out, and spake unto the children of Israel that which he was commanded; and the children of Israel saw the face of Moses, that the skin of Moses’ face sent forth beams: and Moses put the veil upon his face again, until he went in to speak with him’ (Exod. xxxiv. 29–30, 33–35).

---

[1] Jer. *Taanith*, iv. fol. 68.

To hold communion with God is the highest privilege of priesthood, and so Moses is not only a prophet but a priest. ‘Moses and Aaron among his priests. . . . They called upon the Lord, and he answered them’

(Ps. xcix. 6). It is Moses who performed the priestly act at the covenant sacrifice of Sinai. ‘ And Moses took half of the blood, and put it in basons; and half of the blood he sprinkled on the altar ’ (Exod. xxiv. 6). A teaching ascribed to the child Samuel in the Babylonian Talmud says, ‘It is written, The priests shall present the blood (Lev. i. 5). From the receiving of the blood onwards is the function of the priesthood.’[1] Not only Aaron but Moses also founded a line of priests, ‘ And Jonathan, the son of Gershom, the son of Moses, he and his sons were priests to the tribe of the Danites until the day of the captivity of the land ’ (Jud. xviii. 30). The priesthood of Moses was original; the priesthood of Aaron was derived, delegated from Moses. At first the people inquired of God at the tent by Moses, not by Aaron or Eleazar. The Urim and Thummim belong originally to Moses, and he gives them to Aaron. ‘ And thou shalt put in the breastplate of judgement the Urim and the Thummim ’ (Exod. xxviii. 30). ‘ And he placed the breastplate upon him: and in the breastplate he put the Urim and the Thummim ’ (Lev. viii. 8). When Moses came out from the presence of God we are told that his face was horned with light (Exod. xxxiv. 29–35). Aaron, too, according to the Hebrew of Ecclesiasticus, was girded about ‘ with the horns of glory ’ (xlv. 7). The priesthood of Aaron is to be regarded as a delegation and continuation of that of Moses, isolated from the other functions which Moses had been called to perform. When in later days Simon became ‘ leader and high priest ’ (I. Mac. xiv. 41), there was a recombination of the functions of Moses and Aaron.

The prophecy of Deuteronomy was, ‘ The Lord thy God will raise up unto thee a prophet from the midst of thee, of thy brethren, like unto me; unto him ye shall hearken ’ (xviii. 15). The reference must be to a prophet-priest, among other things the founder of a new high priestly dynasty in virtue of his prophetic powers, and privilege of communion with God. In the message of the man of God to Eli we find a similar prophecy to that of Deuteronomy. ‘ And I will raise me up a faithful priest, that shall do according to that which is in mine heart and in my mind ’ (I. Sam. ii. 35). If we read the account of sacrificial customs at Shiloh, and compare the enactments of Deuteronomy xviii., we notice an affinity, and they cannot well be entirely independent. It is commonly supposed that the story of Samuel has been worked over at a later date by a Deuteronomist, but it would seem to be equally true that the writer of Deuteronomy xviii. had I. Samuel ii. in mind, and presumably before the Deuteronomist had converted the prophecy of a faithful priest, which must originally have been intended to refer to Samuel, into a prophecy relating to Zadok and his house (ii. 35b; cf. ii. 10b).

---

[1] Bab. *Berakoth*, v. 1, fol. 31b.

Samuel certainly performed priestly functions. Three times we are told that as a child he ministered before, or unto the Lord (ii. 11, 18, iii. 1), and the verb is that commonly used of the service of the priests in the temple. He offers sacrifice (vii. 9–10), and leads in worship (xv. 30–31), he anoints both Saul (x. 1) and David (xvi. 13) king. Yet he is certainly a prophet, and is recognised as such from childhood. ‘ And all Israel from Dan even to Beersheba knew that Samuel was found faithful to be a prophet of the Lord ’ (iii. 20). He is both faithful priest and faithful prophet. Both prophecies are fulfilled in him. ‘ I will raise me up a faithful priest, that shall do according to that which is in mine heart and in my mind ’ (ii. 35). ‘ I will raise them up a prophet from among their brethren, like unto thee ; and I will put my words in his mouth, and he shall speak unto them all that I shall command him ’ (Deut. xviii. 18).

At a later period another fulfilment of the two prophecies is to be found in Elijah, another prophet-priest to whom the word of the Lord came (I. Kings

xviii. 1), who offers sacrifice (xviii. 32–33, 36–38) and anoints kings (xix. 15–16) and restores the worship of Jehovah (xviii. 19–40).

Now we understand the statements of the first book of the Maccabees. ‘ And they pulled down the altar, and laid up the stones in the mountain of the house in a convenient place, until there should come a prophet to give an answer concerning them’ (iv. 45–46). ‘The Jews and the priests were well pleased that Simon should be their leader and high priest for ever, until there should arise a faithful prophet ’ (xiv. 41). The disposal of the stones of the altar and the settlement of the high priesthood in the family of Simon were only provisional, until a prophet-priest like Moses, like Samuel and Elijah, should arise, who by virtue of a special revelation would reform the worship of Jehovah and set up a new high priestly dynasty. The connexion between the prophetic and high priestly office is intimate. A member of the Aaronic line is a prophet by virtue of his priesthood. Certain of the prophets were priests by virtue of the gift of prophecy.

The connexion between the high priesthood and prophecy is found in each period of Jewish history. In the gospel of St. John we read, ‘ Now this he said not of himself : but being high priest that year, he prophesied that Jesus should die for the nation ’ (xi. 51). In the tractate ‘ Shebuoth ’ we read, ‘ Extensions are added to both city and courtyard (of the temple) only in the presence of a king, prophet, Urim and Thummim, and of the great Sanhedrin, consisting of seventy-one, two thankofferings and the chorus.’[1] The high priest was not included in the Sanhedrin, for we are told, ‘ A tribe, a false prophet, or a high priest can only be tried by a court of seventy-one judges.’[2] ‘ Urim and Thummim ’ cannot here be used as a synonym for the high priest, for, when distinguished, the high priest takes precedence of a prophet. ‘ A high priest has the preference to a prophet: And let Zadok the priest with Nathan the prophet (I. Kings i. 34); hence the priest precedes the prophet.'[1] Again we are told, 'Abba Saul said, There were two valleys on the olive mountain, an upper and a lower one; the lower one was sanctified strictly in the manner prescribed by the *Mishnah*, while the upper one was sanctified only by the ascendants from the exile, in the absence of both king and Urim and Thummim.'[2] Urim and Thummim were certainly absent after the captivity (Ezra ii. 63; Neh. vii. 65), but not the high priest, so that again one cannot stand for the other. The 'prophet,' therefore, must be the person who bears the Urim and Thummim, and so must be identical with the high priest. If this be true in the Talmud, it is not improbably true in the passage from Josephus, 'Let the high priest and the prophet and the senate come together, and decide what seems good to them.'[3] 'The high priest' is 'the prophet,' and 'the high priest and the prophet' refers only to one man in his two capacities.

---

[1] ii. 1.

[2] *Sanhedrin*, i. 5.

---

[1] Bab. *Horayoth*, iii. 6, ed. Rodkinson, p. 25.

[2] *Shebuoth*, ii. 1, p. 21; *Sanh.*, T. iii. 4.

[3] *Ant.* IV. viii. 14.

CHAPTER II

THE ELDERS OF THE GREAT SANHEDRIN

At this point Josephus does not say how many judges are included in the senate. Yet when he was appointed governor of Galilee he appoints a council of seventy, imitating presumably the sanhedrin of Jerusalem. 'He chose out seventy of the most prudent men, and those elders in age, and appointed them to be rulers of all Galilee, as he chose seven judges in every city to hear the lesser quarrels; for as to the greater causes, and those wherein life and death were concerned, he enjoined they should be brought to him and the seventy elders.'[1] In his 'Life' he says, 'So I was willing to have the principal of the Galilæans, in all seventy, as hostages for their fidelity, but still under the notion of friendship. Accordingly I made them my friends and companions as I journeyed, and set them to judge causes; and with their approbation it was that I gave my sentences.'[2] The Zealots likewise set up a similar tribunal. 'And now these Zealots and Idumeans were quite weary of barely killing men, so they had the impudence of setting up fictitious tribunals and judicatures for that purpose. . . . So they called together, by a public proclamation, seventy of the principal men of the populace, for a show, as if they were real judges, while they had no proper authority. . . . Now the seventy judges brought in their verdict, that the person accused was not guilty.'[3]

---

[1] *Wars*, II. XX. 5.

[2] § 14.

[3] *Wars*, IV. V. 4.

As early as the first years of the Babylonian captivity Ezekiel speaks of ‘ seventy men of the elders of the house of Israel ’ at Jerusalem (viii. 11). Seventy was the favourite number among the Jews for the members of a council or similar body, presumably as possessing special divine sanction. The great sanhedrin of Jerusalem consisted of seventy or seventy-one members. The tractate ‘ Sanhedrin ’ says, ‘ The great sanhedrin consisted of seventy-one members, and the lesser of twenty-three. Whence do we know that the great sanhedrin should consist of seventy-one ? It is written, Gather unto me seventy men of the elders of Israel (Num. xi. 16). These with Moses make seventy-one. R. Jehuda holds that there should be seventy only.’ [1] The reference is to the appointment of the seventy elders by Moses in the wilderness. ‘ And the Lord said unto Moses, Gather unto me seventy men of the elders of Israel, whom thou knowest to be the elders of the people, and officers over them. . . . And he gathered seventy men of the elders of the people, and set them round about the Tent. And the Lord came down in the cloud, and spake unto him, and took of the spirit that was upon him, and put it upon the seventy elders ’ (Num. xi. 16, 24–25).

A similar number, we remember, was selected, according to the tradition, for the translation of the Old Testament into Greek. In the letter of Demetrius to Ptolemy we read, ‘ If then it please thee, O king, thou mayest write to the high priest of the Jews, to send six of the elders out of every tribe, and those such as are most skilful in the laws.’ [2] So likewise in the letter of Ptolemy to Eleazar, ‘ Thou wilt therefore do well to choose out and send to me men of a good character, who are now elders in age, and six in number out of every tribe. These by their age must be skilful in the laws, and of abilities to make an accurate interpretation of them.’ [3] So, too, Eleazar wrote to Ptolemy :

---

[1] *Sanh.* i. 6.

[2] Josephus, *Ant.* xii. ii. 4.

[3] xii. ii. 5.

'We have chosen six elders out of every tribe, whom we have sent, and the law with them.'[1] Yet Josephus speaks of them as seventy only: 'It does not seem to me to be necessary to set down the names of the seventy elders who were sent by Eleazar.'[2] 'And Ptolemy heard that they were come, and that the seventy elders were come also.'[3]

In our Lord's time the sanhedrin consisted of high priests, elders and scribes. According to Josephus the high priests were the actual high priest, ex-high priests, and other members of the high priestly families. A passage in the 'Wars of the Jews' makes it plain that sons of high priests are themselves also called high priests: 'Some also there were who, watching for a proper opportunity when they might quietly get away, fled to the Romans, of whom were the high priests Joseph and Jesus, and of the sons of the high priests three, whose father was Ishmael, who was beheaded in Cyrene, and four sons of Matthias, as also one son of the other Matthias, who ran away after his father's death, and whose father was slain by Simon, the son of Gioras, with three of his sons, as I have already related: many also of the other nobility went over to the Romans, together with the high priests.'[4] This view is confirmed by Acts: 'And it came to pass on the morrow, that their rulers and elders and scribes were gathered together in Jerusalem; and Annas the high priest was there, and Caiaphas, and John, and Alexander, and as many as were of the kindred of the high priest' (iv. 5–6). A little later they are summarised as 'the high priests and the elders' (iv. 23).

The court which tried the apostles, we are told, was no local sanhedrin, but the great sanhedrin of the nation. 'The high priest came, and they that were with him, and called the council together, even all the senate of the children of Israel' (v. 21). In a speech attributed to St. Paul, St. Luke uses the term

---

[1] *Ant.* XII. ii. 6. [2] XII. ii. 7. [3] XII. ii. 11. [4] VI. ii. 2.

'presbytery,' meaning apparently the whole council, and not merely those whom he calls elders : 'The high priest doth bear me witness, and all the presbytery' (Acts xxii. 5). The same thought, presumably, was in his mind when he began a sentence in the gospel, though afterwards, realising that the word might be taken in a more restricted sense, as referring to 'elders' only, he adds a reference to 'the chief priests and scribes.' 'The presbytery of the people was gathered together, and the chief priests and scribes; and they led him away into their council' (Luke xxii. 66). The chief priests and scribes, being members of the presbytery in the wider sense, are properly speaking elders, as follows also from the precedent for the sanhedrin adopted in the Talmud, the seventy elders appointed by Moses in the wilderness. Yet they are not explicitly called 'elders' in the New Testament, the designation being limited to those members of the sanhedrin who are neither chief priests nor scribes. Frequently all three groups of members are mentioned : 'the elders and chief priests and scribes' (Matt. xvi. 21; Mark viii. 31 ; Luke ix. 22), 'the chief priests and the elders and the scribes' (Mark xiv. 53, xv. 1). St. Luke speaks also of the 'principal men' instead of the 'elders,' 'the chief priests and the scribes and the principal men of the people' (xix. 47). Sometimes only two of the three groups are named : 'the chief priests and the elders of the people' (Matt. xxi. 23, xxvi. 3, 47, xxvii. 1), 'the chief priests and the elders of the Jews' (Acts xxv. 15), 'the chief priests and elders' (Matt. xxvii. 3, 12, 20, xxviii. 11–12 ; Acts iv. 23, xxiii. 14), 'the chief priests and principal men of the Jews' (Acts xxv. 2), 'the chief priests and scribes of the people' (Matt. ii. 4). Clearly, however, the whole council is not intended in every instance.

Josephus has a somewhat different method of designating the members of the sanhedrin, and instead of 'elders' and 'scribes' he speaks of 'men of power' and ‘notables.’ Probably he is not always referring exclusively to the sanhedrin. We hear of ‘the chief priests and men of power and the most notable of the city,’ [1] ‘the chief priests with the men of power and the council,’ [2] ‘the men of power with the chief priests, and the notables of the Pharisees,’ [3] ‘the men of power with the chief priests,’ [4] ‘the chief priests with the notables,’ [5] ‘the chief priests and the council.’ [6] Perhaps ‘the notables of the Pharisees’ are to be identified with the scribes, but there is nothing to shew that the ‘notables’ are necessarily ‘scribes,’ or the ‘men of power’ ‘elders.’

St. Luke includes both the chief priests and the elders among ‘the rulers’: ‘their rulers and elders and scribes’ (Acts iv. 5), ‘ye rulers of the people and elders’ (iv. 8), ‘the chief priests and the rulers and the people’ (Luke xxiii. 13), ‘the chief priests and our rulers’ (xxiv. 20). Yet he calls Joseph of Arimathæa not a ruler but a ‘councillor’ (xxiii. 50). To St. John, however, Nicodemus is ‘a ruler of the Jews’ (iii. 1). Josephus would seem to limit the description ‘rulers’ to the chief priests, ‘the rulers of Jerusalem,’ [7] ‘the rulers and the counsellors,’ [8] ‘the rulers together with their men of power,’ [9] ‘the men of power and certain of the rulers.’ [10]

The principal enemies of our Lord were the chief priests and scribes rather than the elders, so that when it is a question not of official acts of the sanhedrin, but of unofficial acts of hostility on the part of individuals, the elders are mentioned last, as ‘(the chief priests and) the scribes and the elders’ (Matt. xxvi. 57, xxvii. 41; Mark xi. 27, xiv. 43; Luke xx. 1). Frequently the elders are not mentioned at all, as ‘the chief priests and the scribes’ (Matt. xx. 18, xxi. 15; Mark x. 33, xi. 18, xiv. 1, xv. 31), or ‘the scribes and the principal men of the people' (Luke xix. 47). Very often the scribes are mentioned alone.

---

[1] *Wars*, II. xiv. 8.
[2] II. xvi. 2.
[3] II. xvii. 3.
[4] II. xv. 2, xvii. 5, 6.
[5] II. xv. 3, xvii. 2.
[6] II. xv. 6.
[7] II. xvi. 1.
[8] II. xvii. 1.
[9] II. xvii. 1.
[10] II. xxi. 7.

The president of the great sanhedrin of Jerusalem according to the New Testament was the high priest. The evidence is abundant and beyond question (Mark xiv. 60; John xviii. 24; Acts v. 21, vii. 1, xxii. 5, xxiii. 2, xxiv. 1, etc.). The evidence of Josephus is to the same effect. 'Cæsar appointed Hyrcanus to be high priest. . . . When Hyrcanus saw that the members of the sanhedrin were ready to pronounce the sentence of death upon Herod, he put off the trial to another day.'[1] 'The king deprived Joseph of the high priesthood, and bestowed the succession to that dignity on the son of Ananus, who was also himself called Ananus. . . . He assembled the sanhedrin of the judges, and brought before them the brother of Jesus, who was called Christ, whose name was James, and some others.'[2] Josephus in his exposition of the Mosaic law says the same thing, as we have seen. 'Let them send up the case undetermined to the holy city, and there let the high priest and the prophet and the senate come together, and decide what seems good to them.'[3]

According to the Talmud, however, not the high priest but the *Nasi*, or Prince, is president of the sanhedrin. 'When the Prince enters, all the people stand, and do not sit until he bids them do so. . . . The sanhedrin was arranged in the form of a semicircle, so that they might all see each other. The Prince sat in the middle with the elders on his right and left. R. Eleazar, the son of Zadok, said: When Rabban Gamaliel sat in Jabne, my father and another sat on his right, and the other elders on his left.'[4] The presidency of the sanhedrin is given not only to Gamaliel II, but to Gamaliel I of apostolic days. 'It happened once with Rabban Gamaliel and the elders, that they were sitting on the steps in the Temple Mount, with Johanan the scribe on the one side in front of them. They said to him: Write to our brethren of Upper and Lower Galilee . . .'[1] The New Testament picture of this Gamaliel is very different. 'And the high priest came, and they that were with him, and called the council together, even all the senate of the children of Israel. . . . And there stood up one in the council, a Pharisee, named Gamaliel, a doctor of the law, had in honour of all the people' (Acts v. 21, 34). Apparently the compilers of the Talmud read back the state of things which existed in the academical sanhedrin of Jabne or elsewhere, into the earlier records, though possibly it may not have been so much a reading back as an idealising of the actual, that just as the Pharisaic party was organised as a church within a church, or nation within a nation, so there was a sanhedrin within a sanhedrin, the inner body consisting of rabbis only, the chief rabbi being regarded as president, though functioning only through the larger body in which they had to recognise members who ideally should not have been there and whose existence from this point of view was ignored. The account in Acts might be interpreted as supporting this view, for although the high priest presides it is Gamaliel who 'commanded to put the men forth a little while' (v. 34), and it is his judgment which sways the assembly. 'And to him they agreed' (v. 40).

---

[1] *Ant.* XIV. viii. 5, ix. 5.

[2] XX. ix. 1.

[3] IV. viii. 14.

[4] *Sanh.*, T. vii. 8, viii. 1.

Not all the members of the sanhedrin apparently were of equal rank and importance, quite apart from the distinction between the chief priests, elders and scribes. There would seem to have been an inner circle, or cabinet. In the Talmud we find mention of the 'chamber of the counsellors,' or the 'chamber of the *prohedrin*' as it was called at a later date, 'by the side of the hall of Hewn Stones where the sanhedrin met.' In the *Mishnah* of the tractate 'Yoma' we read: 'Seven days before the day of Atonement they remove the high priest from his house to the chamber of the *prohedrin*.'[1] In the Babylonian *Gemara* this is explained: 'R. Jehudah said, Was it the chamber of the *prohedrin?* Was it not the chamber of the counsellors ? At first it was called the chamber of the counsellors, but when the high priesthood came to be bought with money, and changed as the *prohedrin* every year, it was afterwards called the chamber of the *prohedrin*. What is meant by *Prohedrin*? Officers.'[2]

---

[1] *Sanh.*, T. ii. 6.

The designation *prohedrin* is Greek in origin. At Athens, in early days, the *prohedroi* were the nine executive members of the council, chosen afresh by each new president, who conducted the business at meetings. They were both assessors and deputies of the chief president, and so with him the ten principal men of the council. The *Gemara* suggests that there was a comparable group of members of the great sanhedrin of Jerusalem, called *prohedrin*, who apparently were chosen afresh with each change in the high priesthood, and so practically every year, like the Greek councillors from whom the *prohedroi* were drawn. They were the assessors of the high priest and in a special sense his counsellors, a standing executive committee. The chamber of the counsellors or *prohedrin* was evidently an ante-room, or committee-room, of the great council chamber, where preliminary consultations were held, and where the high priest took up his abode seven days before the day of the Atonement.

Whether this is the correct interpretation or not, it is certain that on occasion the great council of Jerusalem acted through a committee of its principal members. When the trouble arose over the building of the wall to stop Agrippa's view of the temple courts, Josephus tells us, 'They sent ten of their principal men to Nero, as also Ishmael the high priest, and Helcias, the keeper of the sacred treasure.'[3] Elsewhere in a number of places he tells us of 'the ten principal men of the council ' of Tiberias,[1] a city organised on Greek lines, and just as for the benefit of his Greek readers he likens the Pharisees to the Stoics,[2] and the Essenes to the Pythagoreans,[3] so here he recognises in the embassy to Nero the Jewish equivalent of the ten principal men of the Greek communities. The number, however, is not really ten, but twelve, the two chief members of the mission being the high priest and the treasurer of the temple, who are not included in the ten. Among the Greeks the president was the chief of the ten principal men, not an addition to the number, so that the number of members of the embassy must have been determined on other grounds, not by imitating the practice of the Greeks, but in accordance with Jewish tradition. Yet the existence of the title *prohedrin* suggests that Josephus was not original in equating the similar Jewish and Greek officials.

---

[1] i. 1.

[2] i. 1, fol. 8b.

[3] *Ant.* xx. viii. 11.

The idea of employing twelve men for an embassy evidently had its origin in the story of the twelve spies sent by Moses to spy out the promised land. ' And the Lord spake unto Moses, saying, Send thou men, that they may spy out the land of Canaan, which I give unto the children of Israel : of every tribe of their fathers shall ye send a man, every one a prince among them ' (Num. xiii. 1–2). As with the spies the twelve ambassadors to Nero doubtless were intended to represent the twelve tribes, like the seventy-two elders who translated the Old Testament, in that case six to a tribe. The number seventy indeed for members of the great sanhedrin has ultimately the same origin, for according to the Talmud it was determined by the precedent of the seventy elders appointed by Moses in the wilderness, who with Eldad and Medad, who ' were of them that were written,' make up the seventy-two, six to each tribe (Num. xi. 24–26). On symbolical grounds therefore the Jews considered twelve the proper number for a small embassy, as seventy was for a council or larger mission. Josephus gives an interesting example of the use of both numbers in his account of the treachery of Varus. 'He called to him twelve of the Jews of Cæsarea, of the best character, and ordered them to go to Ecbatana, and inform their countrymen who dwelt there, That Varus hath heard that you intend to march against the king. . . . He also enjoined them to send seventy of their principal men to make a defence for them as to the accusation laid against them. So when the twelve messengers came to their countrymen at Ecbatana, and found that they had no designs of innovation at all, they persuaded them to send the seventy men also. . . . So these seventy went down to Cæsarea together with the twelve ambassadors.' [1]

---

[1] *Life*, §§ 13, 33, 57 ; *Wars*, II. xxi. 9.

[2] *Life*, § 2.

[3] *Ant.* xv. x. 4.

For various purposes the sanhedrin and other courts may be represented by three. 'Non-capital cases are to be tried by a tribunal of three judges: cases of robbery and personal violence by three; cases involving whole or half damages, repaying double, or repaying fourfold or fivefold, and cases of forcing, seduction and libel by three—so R. Meir. . . . Cases involving scourging by three; the decision as to the intercalation of the month and the intercalation of the year by three—so R. Meir; but according to R. Shimeon, the son of R. Gamaliel, the case is begun by three, discussed by five, and concluded by seven. But if it be concluded by three only, the intercalation holds good. The laying-on of the elders' hands, and the breaking of the heifer's neck are to be determined by three according to R. Shimeon, but R. Jehuda says five; decisions as to *Halisa* and Refusal by three; fourth year plants and second tithe of unknown value by three; cases dealing with consecrated articles by three; valuations, if movable property, by three—according to R. Jehuda one of them should be a priest.' [2] 'Non-capital cases are to be tried by three judges; but according to Rabbi they are to be tried by five, so that the decision may be supported by three. Arbitration may be effected by three—so R. Meir; but the majority hold that one suffices. The *Semika* (ordination) is to be decided by three, and the laying-on of the elders' hands by three; but R. Jehuda holds that it is by five.'[1] One saying of the Talmud sums up all the rest, 'Every council of three in Israel is like the council of Moses.'[2]

---

[1] *Life*, § 11.

[2] *Sanh.*, M. i. 1–3.

---

[1] *Sanh.*, T. i. 1.

[2] *Rosh ha-shanah,* ii. 9, fol. 25a.

CHAPTER III

THE ELDERS OF THE LESSER SANHEDRINS

We now turn to the first part of the statement of Josephus. 'Let there be seven men to act as magistrates in each city, men exercised already both in virtue and in zeal for righteousness: and to each magistracy let two men of the tribe of Levi be assigned as officers.'[1] Josephus gives several other references to these seven men who are to act as judges. 'If he in whom the trust was reposed, without any deceit of his own, lose what he was entrusted withal, let him come before the seven judges, and swear by God that nothing hath been lost willingly.'[2] He tells us that in Galilee 'he chose seven judges in every city to hear the lesser quarrels.'[3] In Deuteronomy we read, 'Judges and officers shalt thou make thee in all thy gates, which the Lord thy God giveth thee, according to thy tribes: and they shall judge the people with righteous judgement' (xvi. 18). According to the chronicler these were Levites in the days of David, but more probably he is giving the practice of his own time. 'And the Levites were numbered from thirty years old and upward . . . and six thousand were officers and judges' (I. Chron. xxiii. 3–4). The officers are still to be Levites according to the exposition of Josephus, but not the judges.

These seven men in each city who act as judges are probably to be identified with the seven principal men of a city spoken of in the Talmud. 'Rabba said: What is said, that the money obtained for sacred property must be spent only on other sacred things, applies only to a case where it was not sold by the seven leading men of the town, in the presence of the townsmen, but if they did so, it may be spent even on drinking beer. There was a hill on which had stood a prayer house, which Rabbina wanted to sow. He came to R. Ashi, and asked whether he might do so. He answered him: Go and buy it from the seven leading men of the city, in the presence of the townsmen, and then you may sow it.'[1] 'It is so only when the old holy scrolls had been bought by the seven leading men of the town, in the presence of the townsmen, without any condition'[2] 'R. Johanan said in the name of R. Meir: When the inhabitants of one town went away to another town, and the leading men of that town ordered them to give charity for the poor of that town, they should give.'[3] The seven leading men clearly represent the inhabitants of a city and transact business on behalf of the community, buying and selling and collecting alms.

---

[1] *Ant.* IV. viii. 14. [2] IV. viii. 38. [3] *Wars*, II. xx. 5.

The elders of the Jews who came to Jesus from the centurion on behalf of his servant are probably to be identified with certain of the seven leading men of Capernaum. 'And when he heard concerning Jesus, he sent unto him elders of the Jews, asking him that he would come and save his servant. And they, when they came to Jesus, besought him earnestly, saying, He is worthy that thou shouldest do this for him: for he loveth our nation, and himself built us our synagogue' (Luke vii. 3–5). Special interest in the fabric of a synagogue is just what we should expect of the seven leading men in whose special charge it was.

Local sanhedrins, as well as the great sanhedrin of Jerusalem, are mentioned in the gospels (Matt. v. 22, x. 17; Mark xiii. 9). The seven leading men of a city are thus the elders of the local sanhedrin, and correspond to the seventy elders of the great sanhedrin of Jerusalem.

---

[1] Bab. *Megillah*, iv. 1, p. 71. [2] iv. 1, p. 73. [3] iv. 1, p. 73.

Like seventy and twelve, seven is a symbolical number: it is the number of completion or perfection, consecrated by God Himself in the week of creation. 'And on the seventh day God finished his work which he had made; and he rested on the seventh day from all his work which he had made. And God blessed the seventh day, and hallowed it' (Gen. ii. 2–3). Enumerating the men who are to be called to read in the synagogue on different days, the Talmud says, 'and seven on the sabbath.'[1] It is possible that the seven lectors were originally identical with the seven leading men, or elders. In the temple according to the Talmud were certain treasury officials, or bursars, possibly the distributors of the offerings for the priests, who were called *amarkelin.* Their duties, therefore, were not altogether unlike the financial duties of the seven leading men of a city, and in number they were the same. 'Not less than three treasurers and seven bursars must be appointed.'[2]

Ideally, like the members of the great sanhedrin of Jerusalem, the local elders were scribes, or doctors of the law, men who had received ordination as judges or teachers, and in later days would have received the official title of rabbi. Probably no sanhedrin was without such experts in the law. They appear to have been appointed to the local councils by the great sanhedrin of Jerusalem. So we read in the *Tosefta* of the tractate 'Sanhedrin.' 'But from the time that the disciples of Shammai and Hillel grew so numerous, these few courts did not suffice for their needs, and opposing views increased in Israel. Therefore they (in the chief court in Jerusalem) used to send and seek out everyone who was wise and sane, fearing sin and of blameless past, and from whom the spirit of health descended. Such a one they made a judge in his city. After he had served as a judge in his own city they brought him up and gave him a seat in the court in the chamber of the Temple Wall; and from there they promoted him to the court of the Hewn Chamber.'[1]

---

[1] *Meg.* iii. 2, Bab. p. 57.

[2] *Shekalim*, v. 2.

Hillel himself seems to have begun his career in a similar way, by making his mark in the local sanhedrin of Bethyra, the Babylonian colony in Batanea. 'Seven rules of interpretation did the elder Hillel expound before the elders of Bethyra.'[2] The story is told at length in the tractate 'Pesachim.' 'The rabbis taught: The *Halakah* in the *Mishnah* was not known to the children of Bethyra; for it once happened that the fourteenth (of Nisan) occurred on a sabbath, and they did not know whether the passover sacrifices superseded the due observance of the sabbath or not. They therefore commenced to look around for a man who knew the *Halakah*, and they were told that there was a man who had recently come from Babylon, called Hillel of Babylon, and who had learned under the two greatest men of that generation, namely, Shemaiah and Abtalion; he would probably be able to aid them in their dilemma. They sent for him and asked him: Dost thou know whether the passover sacrifice supersedes the sabbath? and he answered: Have we only one passover sacrifice that supersedes the sabbath? are there not over two hundred sacrifices that supersede the sabbath? . . . When they heard this, they immediately placed him at their head and made him a prince. Thereupon he sat all day and preached upon the *Halakoth* of the passover. Subsequently Hillel began to reproach them, and said: What induced you to set me up as a prince among you? Only your own idleness in not taking advantage of the learning of the two great men of your generation, Shemaiah and Abtalion.'[3]

In our Lord's time such expert teachers of the law were to be found, it would seem, in every local Jewish community in the land. 'And it came to pass on one of those days, that he was teaching; and there were

---

[1] T. vii. 1.

[2] T. vii. 11.

[3] Bab. *Pes.* vi. 1, pp. 126–7; cf. Jer. *Pes.* fol. 33a.

Pharisees and doctors of the law sitting by, which were come out of every village of Galilee and Judæa and Jerusalem ' (Luke v. 17).

Yet apparently learned elders were a minority in the local courts. In the *Tosefta* of the tractate ' Sanhedrin ' we are told : ' Every sanhedrin in which are two members competent to speak, and all to comprehend, is worthy of being a sanhedrin. If there are three, it is an average assembly ; if four, a wise one.' [1] This, presumably, is intended to describe the condition of things in the local courts after the destruction of Jerusalem, but probably it would be even more true of the sanhedrins with more mixed membership before. When the academical sanhedrin of Jabne, or elsewhere, had taken the place of the great sanhedrin of Jerusalem, something like the ideal would seem to have been realised in practice, for the judges of the local Jewish courts consisted of rabbis only. That elders and rabbis are identical is the assumption throughout the Talmud, for the local sanhedrins as for the great sanhedrin. ' R. Johanan said : Laying the hand upon the elders means to ordain one a rabbi.' [2] In the tractate ' Berakoth,' in a discussion of the form of benediction to be used on a certain occasion, we read, ' Abbai said : It is necessary for him to offer his thanksgiving in the presence of ten ; for it is written, Let them exalt him in the assembly of the people, etc. (Ps. cvii. 32). Mar Zotra said : Two of them must be rabbis ; as it is said, And praise him in the seat of the elders. Rab Ashe retorted : Say that they must all be rabbis ! But is it written, In the assembly of the elders ? No, it is written, In the assembly of the people. Then say, In the presence of ten ordinary persons and two rabbis.' [3] It is plain that elders and rabbis are equated, and there is no thought that a man may be an elder who is not a rabbi.

In virtue of their office the local elders had special seats in the synagogue. In the *Tosefta* of the tractate 'Megillah' we are told: 'The elders take their places facing the people, and with their back to the sanctuary.'[1] We are reminded of our Lord's words, 'Woe unto you Pharisees! for ye love the chief seats in the synagogues' (Luke xi. 43). 'Beware of the scribes . . . which love . . . chief seats in the synagogues (Luke xx. 46; cf. Mark xii. 38–9; Matt. xxiii. 2, 6). At Alexandria, in imitation of the sanhedrin of Jerusalem, there were seventy-one elders of the local council. In the *Tosefta* of the tractate 'Sukkah' we read: 'R. Jehuda says: Whoever has not seen the basilica synagogue of Alexandria has never seen the great glory of Israel. . . . There were seventy-one golden chairs therein, corresponding to the seventy-one elders, and each of the chairs was worth twenty-five myriad talents of gold.'[2] It is interesting to compare what we read of the sanhedrin of Jerusalem in an alleged report of Marcus, consul of Jerusalem, to Rome, of the ceremonies of the day of Atonement in the second temple. 'Seven days before that day which they call Atonement Day, and which is the most important in the entire year, they prepared at the house of the high priest a place and chairs for the chief of the courts, the *Nasi*, the high priest, his substitute, and for the king; and besides these, also seventy silver chairs for the seventy members of the sanhedrin.'[3]

---

[1] T. viii. 1.

[2] i. 3, p. 30.

[3] ix. 1–5, fol. 54b.

---

[1] T. iv. 227.

[2] T. iv. 6.

[3] *Yoma*, App. p. 145.

CHAPTER IV

THE RULERS OF THE SYNAGOGUES

ANOTHER order of ministers in the Jewish church of importance for our investigation was that of 'ruler of the synagogue,' or 'synagogue chief.' Luke uses both titles of Jairus. 'And behold, there came a man named Jairus, and he was a ruler of the synagogue' (viii. 41). 'There cometh one from the synagogue chief's house' (viii. 49). Mark uses 'synagogue chief' only, employing it where Luke has 'ruler of the synagogue,' as well as in other places. He introduces him as 'one of the synagogue chiefs, Jairus by name' (v. 22). Evidently he was one of a body of synagogue chiefs consisting of several. Matthew says simply 'ruler' in each instance where he has a parallel to Mark or Luke. It is plain that the titles, 'ruler of the synagogue,' 'ruler,' and 'synagogue chief,' are used to describe the same official. Luke tells us also of 'the synagogue chief (who was) moved with indignation because Jesus had healed on the sabbath' (xiii. 14), and in his synagogue. When Paul and Barnabas were at Antioch in Pisidia, we read: 'And they went into the synagogue on the sabbath day, and sat down. And after the reading of the law and the prophets the synagogue chiefs sent unto them, saying, Brethren, if ye have any word of exhortation for the people, say on' (Acts xiii. 14–15). Again there was not one only, but a body of several. Presumably it was the same at Corinth, for we read of 'Crispus, the synagogue chief' and 'Sosthenes, the synagogue chief' (xviii. 8, 17), two at least.

The title 'synagogue chief' would seem to have reference to his position in the congregation during worship, the title 'ruler of the synagogue' to his position in the community. The synagogue chief was responsible for the maintenance of order during the service, he arranged the details of worship, and in particular called upon those who were to read the lessons. In the account of the reading of the law by the high priest on the day of Atonement in the tractate 'Yoma' we read: 'The minister of the synagogue takes the roll of the law and presents it to the chief of the synagogue, the chief of the synagogue presents it to the substitute, and the substitute to the high priest.'[1] The service is described in almost the same words in tractate 'Sotah,' where there is also an almost identical description of the reading of the law by the king on the first day of the feast of Tabernacles.[2] In the Gloss on the passage from 'Yoma' we are told: 'The chief of the synagogue is he by whose command the affairs of the synagogue are appointed; namely, who shall read the prophet, who shall recite the phylacteries, who shall pass before the ark.' The synagogue chief was apparently the 'ruler of the synagogue' appointed to look after the ordering of the service, whether permanently or for a particular occasion. At Antioch in Pisidia we read of several synagogue chiefs at the same service, but the title seems to have been somewhat differently used in the dispersion, and in the holy land there was only one. The Talmud says that a ruler of a synagogue, though not a scribe, ranked immediately after the scribes.[3]

The rulers of the synagogue are presumably to be identified with the *Parnasin*, or almoners. The Talmud takes over the Greek word for ruler to describe them. 'R. Chaiia Bar Ba set rulers over them, that is, he appointed *Parnasin*.'[4] In the modern synagogue the

---

[1] vii. 1.

[2] vii. 7–8.

[3] *Pes.* fol. 49b; *Gittin,* fol. 60a.

[4] *Peah,* fol. 21a.

Parnas is the president of the synagogue, and, we are told, he 'allots the various duties or *mitzvoth* connected with the service.'[1] If the ruler who came to our Lord was a ruler of the synagogue or *Parnas*, there would be special point in the advice, 'Sell all that thou hast, and distribute unto the poor' (Luke xviii. 22). Of the *Parnasin* we read in the Babylonian *Gemara* of the tractate 'Peah': 'The alms-chest is gathered by two and distributed by three. It is gathered by two because a public office is not constituted of less than two, and it is distributed by three, as pecuniary judgments are transacted by three.'[2] Though the *Parnasin* are the almoners of the synagogue, their duties are not merely financial, but pastoral, as their name, which means 'pastors,' suggests. 'R. Chelbo, in the name of R. Ba Bar Zabda, saith: They do not make fewer than three *Parnasin*, for I see the judgments about many matters to be managed by three; therefore much more these which concern life. R. Jose, in the name of R. Johanan, saith: They do not make two brethren *Parnasin*. R. Jose went to Cephar, intending there to set *Parnasin* over them, but they received him not. He went away, after he had said these words before them; Ben Bebai was only set over the lamp wicks, and yet he was reckoned worthy to be numbered with the eminent men of that age. Ye who are set over the lives of men, how much more are ye so? R. Chaggai, when he appointed the *Parnasin*, argued to them out of the law, all dominion that is given is given from the law. By me kings reign.'[3] We notice that only one rabbi is required for the appointment of *Parnasin*. The office was a first step in the Jewish ministry. We gather likewise from the gospels that a 'ruler' might be a 'young man' (Luke xviii. 18, Matt. xix. 20, 22).

---

[1] Box, *The Religion and Worship of the Synagogue*, p. 315.

[2] viii. 7.

[3] *Peah*, fol. 21a.

CHAPTER V

THE DISCIPLES OF THE WISE

A VERY important class of men among the Jews according to the Talmud was that of 'the disciples of the wise.' These were the pupils of the rabbis or elders. The designation included various grades of people from the president and elders of the sanhedrin to those whose study of the law was slight; but commonly it was applied to those who had received instruction in *Torah*, but as yet held no responsible position as teacher or judge. The second of the three great precepts of the men of the Great Synagogue, we are told in the 'Sayings of the Jewish Fathers,' was: 'Raise up many disciples.'[1] St. Paul had been a disciple of the wise. 'I am a Jew, born in Tarsus of Cilicia, but brought up in this city, at the feet of Gamaliel, instructed according to the strict manner of the law of our fathers' (Acts xxii. 3).

The great rabbinical system of later days was traced back to Moses as author. 'Moses received the *Torah* from Sinai, and he delivered it to Joshua, and Joshua to the elders, and the elders to the prophets, and the prophets delivered it to the men of the Great Synagogue.'[2] Thence it had descended in direct line to the rabbis of later days. The members of the sanhedrin were the successors of the seventy elders appointed by Moses in the wilderness, and continued the same tradition. The first and greatest 'disciple of the wise' was Joshua. 'And the Lord said unto Moses, Take thee Joshua the son of Nun, a man in whom is the spirit, and lay thine hand upon him; and set him before Eleazar the priest, and before all the congregation; and give him a charge in their sight. And thou shalt put of thine honour upon him, that all the congregation of the children of Israel may obey. And he shall stand before Eleazar the priest, who shall inquire for him by the judgment of the Urim before the Lord: at his word shall they go out, and at his word they shall come in, both he, and all the children of Israel with him, even all the congregation. And Moses did as the Lord commanded him: and he took Joshua, and set him before Eleazar the priest, and before all the congregation: and he laid his hands upon him, and gave him a charge, as the Lord spake by the hand of Moses' (Num. xxvii. 18–23).

---

[1] *Pirke Aboth*, i. 1.

[2] i. 1.

Josephus's account of this is interesting: 'But Moses was now grown old, and appointed Joshua for his successor, both to receive directions from God as a prophet, and for a commander of the army, if they should at any time stand in need of such a one; and this was done by the command of God, that to him the care of the public should be committed. Now Joshua had been instructed in all those kinds of learning which concerned the laws and God Himself, and Moses had been his instructor.'[1] A little later he tells us: 'Moses taught them also by what means their sacrifices might be the most acceptable to God; and how they should go forth to war, making use of the stones [Urim and Thummim] for their direction, as I have before signified. Joshua also prophesied while Moses was present.'[2] Josephus clearly has in mind the view that Moses and Joshua are to one another as doctor of the law and disciple.

It is a commonplace of rabbinical teaching that a disciple must not expound the law in the presence of his teacher. When the child Samuel is said to have

[1] *Ant.* IV. vii. 2.

[2] IV. viii. 46.

done this before Eli, we are told that the latter replied: 'An excellent teaching hast thou expounded; still thou art one who decided a *Halakah* in the presence of thy master, and whoever does that incurs the penalty of death.'[1] 'Tanchun, the son of R. Ami, happened to be in the city of Hthar and lectured. . . . And they said to him: Is not there here R. Mani of the city of Zur, who is a great scholar, and there is a *Baraitha*: A disciple must not decide a *Halakah* at the place of his master, unless distant from him three parsas.'[2] Josephus plainly regarded the earlier relationship of Joshua to Moses as that of a disciple to his master, who would not therefore venture to make a decision in his presence. In the Talmud this is the common view. 'R. Abbahu said: The Holy One, blessed be He, spake to Moses. . . . Joshua the son of Nun, thy disciple, will minister in thy stead.'[3] After ordination he is himself a teacher and judge. 'Joshua the son of Nun was full of the spirit of wisdom; for Moses had laid his hands upon him' (Deut. xxxiv. 9). And so Josephus could say: 'Joshua also prophesied while Moses was present.'

Joshua was regarded as the disciple of Moses because he was his servant, or minister. 'And Moses rose up, and Joshua his minister' (Exod. xxiv. 13); 'his minister Joshua, the son of Nun, a young man' (xxxiii. 11). The disciples of the wise are not infrequently compared with those who did service of various kinds. 'As the rabbis departed from the school of Rab Hisda they said to him . . . May not our company be like the company of David from which issued Ahithophel. . . . May not our company be like the company of Saul from which issued Doeg the Edomite. . . . May not our company be like the company of Elisha from which issued Gehazi . . . that we may not have a son or disciple who spoiled his food in public, like the Nazarene.'[4] The training of a disciple of the wise was not considered complete unless he had ministered to a rabbi, or disciple of the wise. 'Even if one has studied *Torah* and *Mishnah*, but has not ministered to the disciples of the wise, he is a man of the earth. It is different with Rab Menashya b. Tahlifa because he did minister to the rabbis.'[1] Special rules applied when disciples of the wise acted as servants at a meal: 'If the attendant is a disciple of the wise he gathers up the pieces which are as large as an olive.'[2] 'He says the benediction over the oil and smears it on the head of the attendant. If the attendant is a disciple of the wise, he smears it on the wall, for it is no credit to a disciple of the wise to go out anointed with perfume.'[3]

---

[1] Bab. *Ber.* v. 1, fol. 31b.
[2] Bab. *Sanh.* i. 1, p. 8.
[3] Bab. *Ber.* ix. 1–5, fol. 63b.
[4] Bab. *Ber.* ii. 6–8, fol. 17a and b.

The duties of the disciples to their masters were in some degree general, but in particular they acted as assistants of the rabbis in matters of the law. They might be employed as official witnesses to find evidence for the council. 'Two disciples are stationed in an inner room, while the culprit is in an outer room. . . . These same two disciples are appointed as witnesses against him and stone him.'[4] Disciples are the advocates and may even be among the judges of the accused. 'If one of the disciples say, I have something to plead on behalf of the defendant, the judges accept him in a friendly way and bring him up and seat him with them. If there be reason in his plea they include him as a judge, and he remains with them always; and if not, he still remains with them the whole of that day, so that his rise should not be his fall.'[5] The disciples had an official position in the court. 'The sanhedrin was arranged in the form of a semicircle, so that they might all see each other. The prince sat in the middle with the elders on his right and left. . . . There were three rows of disciples sitting in front of them.'[6] They were the assistants of the judges proper. 'When the services of the children and disciples of the members of the court are required, they pass over the heads of the assembled people. . . . A disciple should not be asked his opinion as soon as he comes in. If, on his entering, he finds the court occupied in some legal discussion, he may not break in upon their talk until he has sat down and discovered what is the subject with which they are occupied.' [1]

---

[1] Bab. *Ber.*, vii. 1, fol. 47b.

[2] *Ber.*, T. vi. 4.

[3] T. vi. 5.

[4] *Sanh.*, T. x. 11.

[5] *Sanh.*, T. ix. 3; cf. M. v. 4.

[6] T. viii. 1–2.

Speaking before Agrippa, St. Paul who, as a pupil of Gamaliel (Acts xxii. 3), was, as we have noticed, a 'disciple of the wise,' declared that he himself had acted in this way as judge, as a temporary member of the court, not merely as an agent of the sanhedrin. 'I both shut up many of the saints in prisons, having received authority from the chief priests, and when they were put to death, I gave my vote against them' (xxvi. 10). In particular he acted in this official capacity at the death of Stephen. 'When the blood of Stephen thy witness was shed, I also was standing by, and consenting, and keeping the garments of them that slew him' (xxii. 20; cf. vii. 58). There were thus two chief orders among the officials of the court, the elders or doctors of the law and their disciples or assistants, the judges proper and their assessors.

The majority of the ancient people of God were of course neither disciples of the wise in the strict sense, nor members of any higher rank in the rabbinical hierarchy. Yet as children of Abraham by birth it was both their duty and their privilege to submit to the yoke of the law of Moses. Those who were not born Jews might be admitted to the fellowship by adoption, by submitting to special rites, for a man by circumcision, baptism and sacrifice, for a woman by baptism and sacrifice. After the destruction of Jerusalem sacrifice was impossible, and the rabbis disputed about the necessity of baptism, or the relative obligation of circumcision and baptism. 'R. Zera said in the name of R. Johanan: He is certainly not to be regarded as a proselyte until he has been circumcised and undergone immersion, and so long as he has not undergone immersion he is still a non-Jew.'[1] 'A proselyte that is circumcised and not baptised, what of him? R. Eliezer saith, Behold, he is a proselyte: for so we find concerning our fathers, that they were circumcised, but not baptized. One is baptized, but not circumcised; what of him? R. Joshua saith, Behold, he is a proselyte: for so we find concerning the maidservants, who were baptized, but not circumcised. But the wise men say: Is he baptized, and not circumcised? Or, Is he circumcised, and not baptized? He is not a proselyte, until he be circumcised and baptized'[2] Circumcision being inapplicable to a woman, and, like sacrifice, probably to be considered a necessary act of obedience to the obligations of the law which had been undertaken, rather than in itself an act of initiation, the one initiatory rite applicable to all proselytes was baptism.

---

[1] T. vii. 8, 10.

According to the *Ascension of Isaiah* the commissioning of Joshua by Moses by the laying on of hands was the model for the recognition and authorisation, not only of disciples of the wise, but of prophets and sons of prophets, by a great prophet like Isaiah. 'And there were forty prophets and sons of prophets: they had come from the villages and from the mountains and the plains . . . that he might place his hands upon them, and that they might prophesy and that he might hear their prophecy.'[3] The rabbinic practice by which a doctor of the law commissioned his disciples is, we see, read back into the days of Isaiah and extended to prophets, in accordance, however, with the pattern incident, Moses being a prophet (Deut. xviii. 15), and Joshua prophesying (Num. xxv. 21).[4]

---

[1] Bab. *Ber.* vii. 1, fol. 47b.

[2] *Yebamoth*, fol. 46b.

[3] vi. 3, 5.

[4] Josephus, *Ant.* IV. viii. 46. See p. 32.

CHAPTER VI

THE AUTHORITY OF THE METROPOLIS

It is of importance to consider not only the fact of the existence of the various elements in the organisation of the Jewish church, but also the precise relationships existing between the various parts. Isaiah speaks of Sion as 'the faithful city,' but the Septuagint translator makes him say 'the faithful metropolis' (i. 26), importing into the text the Greek idea of a metropolis, or mother city. Similarly in the book of Proverbs, 'When he sitteth among the elders of the land' has become 'When he sitteth in the sanhedrin with the old inhabitants of the land' (xxxi. 23), the thought of the sanhedrin being no part of the original. We have therefore evidence of the existence of sanhedrins and the importance of Jerusalem as the mother city of Israel as early as the second century before Christ.

Josephus makes the position of Jerusalem particularly clear. Speaking of Judæa he says: 'It is divided into eleven portions, over which Jerusalem, as the royal city rules, presiding over all the neighbouring country as the head over the body.'[1] He reports, too, a speech of Agrippa to the Jews in which he speaks of Jerusalem as 'this your metropolis,'[2] telling us further that Agrippa was anxious to save 'the temple and metropolis' for the Jews.[3] According to Josephus the sanhedrin at Jerusalem is 'the sanhedrin of the Jerusalemites.'[4] It is for Jerusalem what the local sanhedrins are for other towns, the local municipal council, but in addition it has metropolitical authority over other cities and their courts, as a mother over daughters, as a head over the body. In the days of the Maccabees the council of Jerusalem is spoken of as 'the senate of the nation' (1 Mac. xii. 6), and its members as 'the elders of the country' (xiv. 28), 'the elders of the people' (vii. 33, xii. 35), or 'the elders of Israel' (xi. 23).

---

[1] *Wars,* III. iii. 5. [2] II. xvi. 4. [3] II. xvii. 4. [4] *Life,* § 12.

When before the siege of Jerusalem the Jews were persuaded to pay their arrears of tribute, we are told, 'The rulers and the counsellors divided themselves into the villages, and collected the tributes, and soon forty talents were gathered together, which was the amount in arrears.'[1] Presumably this was no new mode of action, but in accordance with the ordinary practice, and consequently was quickly successful. This view is confirmed by the action of Agrippa immediately afterwards. 'He sent their rulers together with their men of power to Florus to Cæsarea, that he might appoint whom he thought fit to collect the tribute in the country.'[2] In purely secular matters the jurisdiction of the sanhedrin of Jerusalem could not extend beyond the immediately surrounding country and Judæa, but in spiritual things its authority extended beyond. The elders of Jerusalem had authority over the local communities, exercising a kind of territorial jurisdiction. In the *Mishnah* of the tractate 'Taanith' we read: 'It came to pass when the elders from Jerusalem went down to their towns that they saw in Ascalon a patch of blighted corn about the size of the mouth of an oven, and so they appointed a fast. Again they decreed also another fast because wolves devoured two children on the other side of Jordan.'[3] Both Ascalon and the country beyond Jordan were outside the civil jurisdiction of the sanhedrin of Jerusalem. Yet in spiritual matters Jerusalem was recognised as the mother city. A well-known example of this far-reaching authority of the great sanhedrin is to be found in the story of St. Paul.

[1] *Wars*, II. xvii. 1.

[2] II. xvii. 1.

[3] iii. 6.

'Saul . . . went unto the high priest, and asked of him letters to Damascus unto the synagogues, that if he found any that were of the Way, whether men or women, he might bring them bound to Jerusalem . . . that he might bring them bound before the chief priests' (Acts ix. 1–2, 21).

After the destruction of Jerusalem, when the academic sanhedrin at Jabne, or elsewhere, took the place of the great sanhedrin of Jerusalem, so that the centre of Judaism was in Galilee, not in Judæa, we find the elders still exercising the same authority over the local communities. 'R. Jose went to Cephar, intending there to set *Parnasin* over them, but they received him not.'[1]

In later days men called apostles were sent by the president of the sanhedrin or patriarch to Jewish communities of the dispersion to bear important letters and to collect the tribute still exacted for the temple service. Eusebius says, 'It is still the custom for the Jews to name those apostles who carry encyclical letters from their rulers.'[2] In the Theodosian code we read of 'synagogue chiefs and elders of the Jews, and those whom they call apostles, who are sent by the patriarch at a fixed time to exact gold and silver.'[3] According to Epiphanius they were elders of the great sanhedrin: 'These rank after the patriarch and are called apostles, and sit by the patriarch and spend their time with him continually, very often both by night and by day, to take counsel with him and report to him matters connected with the law.'[4] That apostles ranked above ordinary rabbis is also suggested by an epitaph on a girl in Venosa, which tells us that 'two apostles and two rabbis said the lamentation for her.'[5] In this way for centuries the authority of the academical sanhedrin was exercised wherever Jews were to be found.

---

[1] Jer. *Peah*, fol. 21a.

[2] *Comment ad Jesaj.* xviii. 1, in *Coll. Nov. Pat.*, ed. Montfaucon, ii. 425.

[3] XVI. viii. 14.

[4] *Haer.* xxx. 4.

[5] *Corp. Inscr. Lat.* ix. 648.

At all periods the great sanhedrin had complete control over the local sanhedrins. 'The institution of separate tribal sanhedrins can only be carried out by the authority of a court of seventy-one.'[1] The Babylonian *Gemara* speaks of 'the great sanhedrin which ruled all the judges in the lower houses.'[2] It exercised supreme authority in all matters of the law, claiming to have taken the place of Moses who established the first sanhedrin.[3] As we have already noticed, it appointed the members of the local sanhedrins. 'But from the time that the disciples of Shammai and Hillel grew so numerous, these few courts did not suffice for their needs, and opposing views increased in Israel. Therefore they (in the chief court in Jerusalem) used to send and seek out everyone who was wise and sane, fearing sin and of blameless past, and from whom the spirit of health descended. Such a one they made a judge in his city.'[4] Consequently the right of ordination was limited to members of the great sanhedrin. On the principle that 'every council of three in Israel is like the council of Moses,'[5] a rule which is said to date back to the days of Hillel decrees that 'the *Semika* (ordination) is to be decided by three.'[6] In the Babylonian Talmud we are told, 'There is a *Baraitha*: To laying the hand upon the elders . . . three are needed. What does this mean? R. Johanan said, Laying the hand upon the elders means to ordain one a rabbi.'[7] The sphere of the plenary jurisdiction of the great sanhedrin was the holy land. 'The law goes out to all Israel, as it is written, From that place which the Lord shall choose (Deut. xvii. 10).'[8] Ordination therefore was not allowed elsewhere. 'R. Jehoshua b. Levi said, The custom of ordination must not be used out of Palestine. What does he mean? Shall we assume that loss of fines should not be judged at all out of

---

[1] *Sanh.* i. 5.

[2] i. 5, p. 37.

[3] On i. 3, 5, pp. 30, 37.

[4] T. vii. 1.

[5] *Rosh ha-shanah*, ii. 9, fol. 25a.

[6] *Sanh.* T. i. 1.

[7] On i. 3, p. 30.

[8] xi. 2.

Palestine? This is not so, as there is a *Mishnah*: Sanhedrins are to be established in Palestine as well as in other places out of Palestine. He means that one must be ordained in Palestine only.'[1]

The Jerusalem Talmud tells us something of the changes of practice in the method of ordination at different periods. 'There is a tradition, Layings on of hands are performed by three. This laying on of hands is not really a laying on of hands, but is called a laying on of hands when the Prince ordains. R. Abba says, In the beginning each used to ordain his own disciples, just as Rabban Jochanan ben Zakkai ordained R. Eliezer and R. Jehoshua ordained R. Akiba, and R. Akiba ordained R. Meir and R. Simeon. He said, R. Meir agreed at once; the face of R. Simeon became pale. R. Akiba said to him, Let it be enough for thee that I and thy Creator recognise thy virtue. They have restored the honour to this house. They said, If the sanhedrin ordains without the consent of the Prince its ordination is not an ordination; if the Prince ordains without the consent of the sanhedrin his ordination will be an ordination. Again they decreed, that the sanhedrin should not ordain without the consent of the Prince, and the Prince should not ordain without the consent of the sanhedrin.'[2]

It is plain that the rule that ordination must be performed by the laying on of the hands of three persisted until the time of R. Jehoshua and R. Akiba, the practice of ordination by one only being still something of an innovation when R. Meir and R. Simeon were ordained. Ordination by the laying on of the hands of three would thus be the rule of the Jewish church in the days of our Lord and His apostles, and throughout the whole period of the inauguration of the Christian church. When the Jerusalem Talmud was compiled however, ordination by the laying on of hands had evidently disappeared.

---

[1] On i. 3, p. 31.

[2] *Sanh.* i. 1, fol. 19a.

According to the *Tosefta* of the tractate 'Sanhedrin' new members of the court were taken from among the members of the local sanhedrins.[1] In this way it would seem Hillel, from being president of the local sanhedrin of Bethyra, became an elder of the great sanhedrin of Jerusalem. In the *Mishnah* we find what at first sight appears to be a quite different method of selection. 'The sanhedrin sat in the form of a semicircle so that they might all see each other. . . . Before them sat three rows of disciples, each knowing his own place. If it became necessary to appoint another judge, he was appointed from the front row, while one from the second row took his place, and one from the third row that of the second. And for the third row one of the assembled audience was chosen. He did not sit in the place just vacated, but in a place for which he was suited.'[2] The *Tosefta* likewise tells us of the three rows, but says nothing about the appointment of new judges from among them. 'There were three rows of disciples sitting in front of them: the most important first, the second in importance next, and the third in the last row. After this there was no fixed order, except that each should be placed four cubits away from his fellow.'[3]

The two methods of appointing fresh members of the great sanhedrin, from the elders of the local courts and from the disciples of the rabbis, are not however necessarily exclusive, for, as we shall see, the local elders and the disciples of the wise are of practically equivalent rank at meetings of the great sanhedrin. The connexion between the two methods may perhaps be realised better by a study of two other passages of the tractate, one in the *Mishnah* which treats of a defiant elder of a local court, and one in the *Tosefta* which deals with cases of appeal. 'The elder who defies the court. . . . There were three courts: one at the gate of the Temple yard, one at the door of the

---

[1] See pp. 24–5.

[2] *Sanh.* iv. 3–4.

[3] T. viii. 2.

Temple Mount, and one in the Hewn Chamber. They come to the court at the gate of the Temple Mount. . . . Then if they (of the court of the Temple Mount) had heard any tradition (bearing on the point) they told it. If not, they come to the court which is at the gate of the Temple yard. . . . Then if they (of the gate of the Temple yard) had any tradition, they told it. If not, both courts went to the Great Court in the Hewn Chamber, whence the law goes out to all Israel, as it is written, From that place which the Lord shall choose (Deut. xvii. 10).'[1]

'Said R. Jose: At first there were no contendings of opinion in Israel except in the court of the seventy in the Hewn Chamber. Other courts of twenty-three were in the various cities of the land of Israel, and two other courts of twenty-three each were in Jerusalem, one in the Temple Mount, and one in the Chamber of the Temple Wall. If any one were in need of legal direction, he went to the court of his own city, and if there were none there he went to the one nearest his city. If there they knew a tradition bearing on the case they told it to him; if not, he and the instructing judge of that court went together to the court in the Temple Mount. If there they knew a tradition bearing on the case, they told it to them; if not, they and the instructing judge went to the court in the Chamber of the Temple Wall. If there they had a tradition bearing on the case, they told it to them; if not both parties went to the court in the Hewn Chamber. This court consists in all of seventy-one members, and never falls below twenty-three.'[2]

At the final trial in the Hewn Chamber we notice that there are representatives of three other courts present, the local court, the court in the Temple Mount, and the court in the Chamber of the Temple Wall.

A row of disciples, according to the *Tosefta*, consists of twenty-three, the number of the judges in a local court. ‘Thus also used R. Jehuda to say: Every city in which are three rows of twenty-three . . . is fitted to have a sanhedrin.’[1] According to the Babylonian *Gemara* the city must be large enough to provide ‘twenty-three of the small sanhedrin and three rows of twenty-three each.’[2] The number in a row in a sanhedrin is clearly to be the same as the number of judges in a local court. The explanation of the three rows of disciples in one account of the great sanhedrin would therefore seem to be that they represent the three subordinate courts which are present at meetings of the great sanhedrin during cases of appeal as of the defiant elder. The members of the lower courts and the disciples are assessors in the higher court and may be asked to take part in the proceedings. As the elders of the great sanhedrin have authority over the elders of the lesser sanhedrins, so the assessors of the great court may be judges in the local courts. The elders of the higher and lower sanhedrins are of very different rank and authority, and must not be confounded. The local elder has power to teach and judge and make certain decisions, but there is no suggestion that he has power to ordain. Such a thing would be contrary to the whole scheme of organisation of the people of God as constituted by Moses who was claimed as the founder.

---

[1] M. xi. 2.

[2] T. vii. 1; cf. on Bab. x. 4, pp. 254–255.

---

[1] T. iii. 9.

[2] On i. 6, p. 41.

CHAPTER VII

THE TRADITION OF THE SHEKINAH

It was the special privilege of the Jewish people to be guardians of a divine tradition, a tradition which had its origin when 'Moses received the law from Sinai.'[1] The law was an abiding legacy from the great manifestation of God to Moses on Sinai, where He appeared in glory. The experience of Moses on this occasion was the highest privilege ever vouchsafed to man on earth. 'The Lord descended in the cloud, and stood with him there, and proclaimed the name of the Lord. And the Lord passed by before him. . . . And it came to pass, when Moses came down from mount Sinai with the two tables of the testimony in Moses' hand . . . that the skin of his face shone by reason of his speaking with him' (Exod. xxxiv. 5–6, 29). Something of the glory of God remained with him even when he departed from the divine Presence, so that his face, according to the Hebrew, sent forth horns or beams of light. And this was not an experience vouchsafed once for all. Whenever Moses went into the tent of meeting to inquire of God, he was allowed to speak with Him face to face, and again when he came out his face sent forth beams of light. 'When Moses went in before the Lord to speak with him, he took the veil off, until he came out; and he came out, and spake unto the children of Israel that which he was commanded; and the children of Israel saw the face of Moses, that the skin of Moses' face shone' (Exod. xxxiv. 34–35).

[1] *Aboth*, i. 1.

The law was an expression of the glory of God, so that where the law was, there was the glory of the *Shekinah*. When some of the privileges of Moses were delegated to Aaron and he took Moses' place in inquiring of God in the tent of meeting, or holy of holies, the privilege of receiving the glory of the *Shekinah* was transferred to him. At any rate, this seems to have been the view of the son of Sirach, for he tells us, according to the Hebrew margin, that God 'girded him about with the horns of glory' (Ecclus. xlv. 7). The plate of pure gold, called in the Hebrew the 'brightness' or 'glory,' which Aaron wore upon his forehead (Exod. xxviii. 36–38), was symbolical of the spiritual glory of the *Shekinah*. So we read of Simon the son of Onias, 'How glorious was he when the people gathered round him at his coming forth out of the sanctuary! As the morning star in the midst of a cloud, as the moon at the full: as the sun shining forth upon the temple of the Most High, and as the rainbow giving light in clouds of glory' (Ecclus. l. 5–7). In Simon the symbolical is pictured as having become the real. The highest duty under the law was to enter into the holy of holies and hold communion with God. To the son of Sirach in the case of a faithful high priest it is a true participation in the glory of the *Shekinah*. The law is an emanation from the glory of God, which is manifest in the supreme act of obedience to it.

In the earliest days the entry of the high priest into the holy of holies, as of Moses into the tent of meeting, was to inquire of God, and thus to make fresh additions to the body of the law, as occasion required, by the judgment of Urim and Thummim. For its promulgation and administration Moses or Joshua and the elders were associated with him, and in later days the elders of the sanhedrin, of which the high priest was the head only because the high priesthood had absorbed the kingship, and reunited the functions of Moses and Aaron in one person, so that once again one man, like Moses in the beginning, was both leader and priest.

The tractate 'Pirke Aboth' gives the rabbinical view of the transmission of the law. 'Moses received the law from Sinai, and he delivered it to Joshua; and Joshua to the elders, and the elders to the prophets, and the prophets delivered it to the men of the Great Synagogue.'[1] The Great Synagogue covers the period between the return from captivity and the last of the high priests of the house of Zadok, during which Josephus tells us the nation was governed democratically. 'Now he (Joshua the son of Josedech) and his posterity, who were in all fifteen, unto king Antiochus Eupator, were under a democratical government for four hundred and fourteen years.'[2] The government was similar to that of Hellenistic metropolitical cities. Josephus preserves imperial edicts in which the style of address is exactly the same in form as for the Greek communes: 'To the rulers, council and people of the Jerusalemites, and all the nation of the Jews.'[3] 'To the rulers, council and people of the Sidonians.'[4] 'To the rulers, council and people of the Parians.'[5] and so on.[6] Yet the Jewish democracy differed from the democracy of the Greek cities in being so definitely religious. The title 'Great Synagogue,' or 'Great Congregation,' emphasises the spiritual aspect of the community. It is ideally the whole nation assembled at Jerusalem, whether for the promulgation of the law, for deliberation, or for worship. We meet with the designation in several books of the Old Testament (I. Kings viii. 65; II. Chron. vii. 8, xxx. 13; Ezra x. 1; Ps. xxii. 25, xxxv. 18, xl. 9, 10), and once in the Apocrypha (I. Mac. xiv. 28). During this period of religious democracy the tradition of the law was maintained not by a few individuals but by the whole nation, the people of God, the Great Synagogue or the Great

---

[1] i. 1.
[2] *Ant.* xx, x. 2.
[3] xx. i. 2.
[4] xiv. x. 2.
[5] xiv. x. 8.
[6] xiv. x. 12, 17, 21.

Congregation. In the story of Ezra we see the beginning of the institution (x. 1). In the days of the Maccabees we see the emergence of the later sanhedrin, and we hear of 'a great congregation of priests and people and princes of the nation, and of the elders of the country' (I. Mac. xiv. 28). There seem to have been no outstanding figures between Ezra at the beginning and Simon the Just towards the end.

'Pirke Aboth' continues: 'Simon the Just belonged to the last of the Great Synagogue. He used to say: On three things the world stands: on the *Torah*, on the temple service, and on acts of love.'[1] Josephus says: 'When Onias the high priest was dead, his son Simon became his successor. He was called Simon the Just, because of both his piety towards God, and his kind disposition to those of his own nation.'[2] The description being so similar to that of the tractate, it can hardly refer to another. He is to be identified also, it would seem, with Simon son of Onias, 'great among his brethren, and the glory of his people,' of whom we have the description in Ecclesiasticus (l.). This begins with a list of his acts of benevolence, how he 'took thought for his people,' but for the most part it describes the temple worship, the 'service' as it is repeatedly called, carried out in the splendour of an entire obedience to the law. In his day certainly the *Shekinah* had not yet departed from Israel, to use the language of the rabbis, but was still manifest in the priesthood in a devoted obedience to the law. Yet not long after his days the Great Synagogue came to an end amid the horrors of persecution, the temple was profaned, and the last members of the priesthood of the house of Zadok sought refuge in apostacy or flight.

Next, the tractate 'Aboth' says: 'Antigonus, a man of Socho, received the tradition from Simon the Just. He used to say: Be not like slaves who minister unto their Lord on condition of receiving a reward; but be like unto slaves who minister unto their Lord without expecting to receive a reward; and let the fear of Heaven be upon you.'[1] The Talmud tells us nothing further of Antigonus of Socho. The 'Aboth' of R. Nathan, however, says he had two scholars, Zadok and Baithus, who misunderstood his teaching about rewards, and became the founders of the sects of the Sadducees and Baithusees.[2]

---

[1] i. 2.

[2] *Ant.* XII. ii. 5; cf. iv. 1.

The argument cannot be elaborated here, but there seems reason to suppose that Antigonus was the Hebrew editor of the original text of Ecclesiasticus. The original writer was an early example of the Sadducee, but the editor seems to have been a Pharisee, yet a keen supporter of the house of Zadok. This agrees with the legend that Antigonus is to be regarded as the father of the Sadducees. The original author was well versed in Greek thought, and the same is true of the editor. The name Antigonus is Greek. Ecclesiasticus has much to say about rewards, that virtue is its own reward, and likewise about the fear of the Lord, the two themes of the teaching of Antigonus. Various other arguments tend to confirm the hypothesis.

At any rate, it is clear that the Pharisaic editor, like Antigonus, was the head of a rabbinical academy—the earliest of which we have evidence—at a date not much later than the days of Simon the Just. The book marks the transition from the 'congregation,' which is frequently mentioned (i. 30, iv. 7, xxiv. 2, xxxi. 11, xxxiii. 18, xxxviii. 33, l. 13, 20), to the 'house of instruction' (li. 23, cf. 29, Heb.) as the home of wisdom, which is identified with the law. In 'Aboth' this is the position assigned to Antigonus. Wisdom is put before us in Ecclesiasticus as the law which was given as a legacy to the synagogues of Jacob, and then in the appendix as something to be learned in the writer's own academy, which he takes the opportunity of advertising. ‘ All these things are the book of the covenant of the Most High God, even the law which Moses commanded us for a heritage unto the assemblies of Jacob ’ (xxiv. 23). ‘ Draw near unto me, ye unlearned, and lodge in the house of instruction ’ (li. 23). But whoever may have been the Pharisaic editor of Ecclesiasticus, the book agrees with the tractate ‘ Aboth ’ in the view that after the days of the Great Synagogue, when the high priesthood had departed from the house of Zadok, the tradition of the law was continued in the academies of the great doctors of the law. In the minds of the rabbis of later days the succession of scholars of the wise was more important than that of the new line of high priests.

---

[1] i. 3.

[2] v.; Bab. *Aboth*, p. 27.

Ecclesiasticus tells us of the glory of Aaron and of Simon son of Onias, that the glory of the *Shekinah* shone forth in each. In a measure, however, it is regarded as being manifest in all the fathers of the nation. ‘ The Lord apportioned to them great glory ’ (xliv. 2, Heb.). In a verse not found in the Greek, and probably due to the Hebrew editor, guardianship of the tradition is added to the list of titles to greatness. The reference is to the scribes who are not only ‘ wise in word because of their book learning ’ but also ‘ utterers of proverbs because of their guardianship of tradition ’ (xliv. 4). We have thus an early statement of the great doctrine of the rabbis of later date, which appears so frequently in the Talmud, that as the law is a manifestation of the *Shekinah* the guardians of the tradition are in a special sense partakers of the glory. It is the privilege of all engaged in matters of the law : ‘ When three sit and judge the *Shekinah* is in their midst. . . . When two sit and occupy themselves with *Torah* the *Shekinah* is in their midst. . . . Even if an individual sits and occupies himself with *Torah*, the *Shekinah* is with him.’ [1] ‘ He who goes out from the synagogue and enters the house of study to occupy himself with *Torah* is worthy to receive the presence of the *Shekinah*.'[1] 'Whoever partakes of a meal at which a disciple of the wise is present is as though he partakes of the lustre of the *Shekinah*.'[2] Properly the judgments of the high priest are manifestations of the *Shekinah*, but only if in accordance with the *Torah*. So Hannah is said to have rebuked Eli for a wrong judgment. 'Thou art not a lord; neither the *Shekinah* nor the Holy Spirit is with thee, for thou hast judged me in the scale of guilt and not in the scale of merit.'[3] Meditating on *Torah*, however, even a layman is a sharer in the privileges of the priesthood. 'Three who have eaten at one table, and have spoken words of *Torah* over it, are as though they had eaten from the table of the All-present (Blessed be he!), as it is said: And he said unto me, This is the table that is before the Lord (Ezek. xli. 22).'[4]

---

[1] On Bab. *Ber.* i. 1, fol. 6a ; cf. *Aboth*, iii. 3.

The true dignity of the priesthood is measured by knowledge of the *Torah*. A Gentile or a bastard who occupies himself with *Torah* may thus be equal to, even the superior of, the high priest. 'Did not R. Meir say: Whence do we know that even a Gentile who is occupied with the study of the law is likened to a high priest? From, Which if a man do, he shall live on it (Lev. xviii. 5), where it does not specify priest, Levite, or Israelite, but states in general, If a man; whence it may be inferred that a Gentile, too, who occupies himself with the study of the law is equal to a high priest.'[5] 'The following precede one another in order of arrangement: the priest, Levite, Israelite, bastard, *nathin* proselyte, a freed slave; provided, however, they are equally qualified in learning; but if, for example, the bastard be a learned man in the law, while the high priest is an ignorant man, the preference is on the part of the former.'[6] We are told that the governor of

---

[1] On Bab. *Ber.* ix. 1–5, fol. 64a.

[2] On ix. 1–5, fol. 64a.

[3] On v. 1, fol. 31b.

[4] *Aboth*, iii. 4.

[5] On *Abodah Zarah*, i. 1, p. 3.

[6] *Horay.*, iii. 7.

Cæsarea looking on rabbis saw in them 'the faces of angels.'[1] Their faces shone, like that of Moses, with the lustre of the *Shekinah*, the glory of the law. Of Stephen, likewise, when about to make his great exposition of the law, we read: 'And all that sat in the council, fastening their eyes on him, saw his face as it had been the face of an angel' (Acts vi. 15). Of Hillel and forty of his pupils it was said that they were worthy that the *Shekinah* should rest upon them. 'Since the death of the last prophets, Haggai, Zechariah and Malachi, the Holy Spirit has left Israel; nevertheless they were still used to a heavenly voice. It happened once that they had a meeting in the attic of the house of Guriah in the city of Jericho, and a heavenly voice was heard: Among these people there is one who is worthy that the *Shekinah* should rest upon him; but his generation is not fit. And the sages turned their eyes on Hillel the Elder. . . . The same happened again when they had a meeting in an attic in the city of Jamnia, and the heavenly voice said: Among these people is one worthy that the *Shekinah* should rest upon him, but his generation is not fit. And the rabbis turned their eyes on Samuel the Little.'[2] In the farewell benediction of the disciples of R. Ammi we read: 'May thine eyes be illumined with the light of the *Torah*, thy countenance shine like the splendour of the firmament.'[3] From certain rabbis beams of light were said to have proceeded, as from Moses.[4] In the 'Pirke' of R. Eliezer we find: 'R. Eliezer sat down and expounded. His face shone like the light of the sun, and his effulgence beamed forth like that of Moses, so that no one knew whether it was day or night. They went and said to Rabban Jochanan ben Zakkai: Come and see R. Eliezer sitting and expounding, his face shining like the light of the sun and his effulgence beaming like that of Moses, so that no one knows whether it be day or night.'[1] The doctors of the law thus shared the greatest privilege pertaining to the high priests, in particular to Aaron and Simon, son of Onias, according to Ecclesiasticus, from whom as from Moses himself the glory of the *Shekinah* shone forth in beams of light.

---

[1] Jer. *Ber.* fol. 9a.

[2] On Bab. *Sanh.* i, 2, p. 24.

[3] Bab. *Ber.* ii. 6–8, fol. 17a.

[4] Jer. *Ber.* fol. 9a.

With such ideas dominant it is not altogether surprising to find that in rabbinical literature the chief of the rabbis, or doctors of the law, is assumed to have been president of the sanhedrin even before the fall of Jerusalem, and there is no hint that in fact this position was held by the high priest, as the evidence of both the New Testament and Josephus makes plain. Real spiritual authority was conceived as being in the hands of the scribes, and the tradition of the law was through them, not through the chief priests. So far as the priesthood was concerned, it might almost be said that the *Shekinah* had departed from Israel even before the destruction of Jerusalem, but it was to be found with the rabbis. The *Shekinah* being absent from the priesthood, spiritually the priests did not count, and so they are ignored in the history of the tradition of the *Torah.* Consequently, when Jerusalem was destroyed the rabbis stepped naturally into the place which officially had been that of the priests, and constituted a new academical sanhedrin composed entirely of doctors of the law. Henceforth a priest was of little account unless he was also a student of *Torah.* Without question we find the sacred tribute which had been exacted for the maintenance of the priesthood and temple from Jews in every land, transferred to the purposes of the rabbis. They were, indeed, priests after the order of Moses, tracing a spiritual descent from him through the law, belonging to a priesthood greater than that of Aaron, because indeed the priesthood of Aaron had its origin in that of Moses.

---

[1] ii. 3–4 (ed. Friedlander).

PART II

IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

CHAPTER I

THE ORGANISATION OF THE NEW KINGDOM OF GOD

JESUS, when about thirty years of age, St. Luke tells us, was baptized, ' And the Holy Ghost descended in a bodily form, as a dove, upon him, and a voice came out of heaven, Thou art my Son, the beloved ; in thee I am well pleased ' (iii. 22). ' Full of the Holy Spirit he returned from the Jordan, and was led by the Spirit in the wilderness during forty days, being tempted of the devil ' (iv. 1–2), settling with Himself the manner of the kingdom of God. Then ' Jesus returned in the power of the Spirit into Galilee. . . . And he taught in their synagogues ' (iv. 14–15). Conscious of His mission as the Beloved of God, the Elect, in the synagogue of Nazareth He quotes the words of Isaiah (lxi. 1) summing up His office and work : ' The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he anointed me to preach good tidings to the poor ' (iv. 18). He added : 'To-day hath this scripture been fulfilled in your ears ' (iv. 21). St. Mark's summing is : ' Jesus came into Galilee, preaching the gospel of God, and saying, The time is fulfilled, and the kingdom of God is at hand : repent ye, and believe in the gospel ' (i. 14–15). He began to call men to Himself. Those who like Andrew and Peter had been attracted by His teaching by the

Jordan (John i. 40–2) He now calls definitely to discipleship: ‘Come ye after me, and I will make you to become fishers of men’ (Mark i. 17). The calls of Simon, Andrew, James, John and Levi are described in detail (Mark i. 16–20, ii. 14–15).

As with John the Baptist there are two grades of disciples, those who followed Him in the literal sense and those who, accepting Him as their master, followed His teaching. The Jews, as we have seen, admitted Gentiles to the covenant of Israel by baptism. John the Baptist also admitted disciples by baptism, and Jesus did the same. The evidence is too strong to be ignored or explained away. ‘After these things came Jesus and his disciples into the land of Judæa; and there he tarried with them, and baptized’ (John iii. 22). ‘Jesus was making and baptizing more disciples than John’ (John iv. 1). He insisted on its necessity if a man would enter the kingdom He was preaching. He said to Nicodemus: ‘Except a man be born of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God’ (John iii. 5). So we can explain the fact that ‘He appeared to above five hundred brethren at once’ (I. Cor. xv. 6) after His resurrection.

Yet even among those who followed Him in person there was an inner circle. The words of the prophet (Mal. iii. 1) He applied to John the Baptist: ‘Behold, I send my messenger before thy face, who shall prepare thy way before thee’ (Luke vii. 27). So, too, when ‘He stedfastly set his face to go to Jerusalem,’ He ‘sent messengers before his face . . . to make ready for him’ (Luke ix. 51–52). Then we read: ‘After these things the Lord appointed seventy others, and sent them two and two before his face into every city and place, whither he himself was about to come’ (x. 1). These are the first on the roll of His specially accredited ministers: ‘Behold, I have given you authority to tread upon serpents and scorpions, and over all the power of the enemy: and nothing shall in any wise hurt you. Howbeit in this rejoice not, that the spirits are subject unto you; but rejoice that your names are written in heaven' (Luke x. 19–20). As with the great sanhedrin of Jerusalem and various other Jewish councils and bodies mentioned by Josephus, the number seventy is plainly suggested by the seventy elders appointed by Moses, who are likewise described as 'them that were written' (Num. xi. 26).

Within the ranks of the seventy also there was an inner group of twelve: 'He called his disciples; and he chose from them twelve, whom also he named apostles' (Luke vi. 13). These form the highest grade in the kingdom of God. 'I appoint unto you a kingdom, even as my Father appointed unto me, that ye may eat and drink at my table in my kingdom; and ye shall sit on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel' (xxii. 29–30). These, too, so we read, He sent forth on a mission. 'He called the twelve together, and gave them power and authority over all devils, and to cure diseases. And he sent them forth to preach the kingdom of God, and to heal the sick' (Luke ix. 1–2). There can be little doubt that this is another account according to another line of tradition of the mission of the seventy. At any rate the writer of the first gospel took this view, for he conflates the charges to the twelve and seventy, and applies the result to the mission of the twelve (ix. 35–x. 15).

The great Jewish sanhedrin of seventy, as we learn from Josephus, likewise had an upper group of twelve, who, as we have seen,[1] on one occasion went on a mission to Rome, and he gives also several examples of embassies of the same number, a number evidently suggested by the twelve, one out of every tribe, sent to spy out the promised land. Jesus clearly is imitating the example of Moses.

At His transfiguration on the mount we are told, 'As he was praying, the fashion of his countenance was altered, and his raiment became white and dazzling. And behold, there talked with him two men, which were Moses and Elijah; who appeared in glory. . . . Now Peter and they that were with him . . . saw his glory, and the two men that stood with him. . . . And a voice came out of the cloud, saying, This is my Son, my chosen: hear ye him' (Luke ix. 29–35). Jesus, like Moses on mount Sinai, is enveloped in the glory of the *Shekinah.* The voice from heaven declares him the prophet like unto Moses. 'The Lord thy God will raise up unto thee a prophet from the midst of thee, of thy brethren, like unto me; unto him ye shall hearken' (Deut. xviii. 15). As a consequence 'he taught them as having authority, and not as the scribes' (Mark i. 22), an authority indeed greater even than that of Moses. This is the repeated claim of the sermon on the mount: 'It was said to them of old time . . . but I say unto you' (Matt. v. 21–44).

---

[1] See p. 18.

As the prophet like unto Moses He is also a second Samuel, a second Elijah, a prophet-priest, the founder of a new dynasty of priests. On the mount of transfiguration Moses and Elijah 'spake of his decease which he was about to accomplish at Jerusalem' (Luke ix. 31). Like Moses He offers a covenant sacrifice. 'This cup is the new covenant in my blood, even that which is poured out for you' (Luke xxii. 20). A high priest like Aaron, He offers the sacrifice of atonement. 'This is my body which is given for you' (Luke xxii. 19; cf. Lev. xvi. 11, 15). He offers the passover of the new covenant and keeps the feast. 'With desire I have desired to eat this passover with you before I suffer' (Luke xxii. 15). It was as the prophet like unto Moses, the Inaugurator of a new covenant, that He appointed the seventy and the twelve, the council of the elders of the new people of God, with its inner circle of assessors.

The idea that in the Christian church we have a new sanhedrin helps us to understand better the significance of many sayings in the gospels. In Matthew Jesus is recorded as saying to His disciples : ‘ And if thy brother sin against thee, go, shew him his fault between thee and him alone : if he hear thee, thou hast gained thy brother. But if he hear thee not, take with thee one or two more, that at the mouth of two witnesses or three every word may be established. And if he refuse to hear them, tell it unto the church : and if he refuse to hear the church also, let him be unto thee as the Gentile and the publican ’ (xviii. 15–17). A passage from the *Tosefta* of the tractate ‘ Sanhedrin ’ may be compared : ‘ As for others liable to death penalties in the court, they can only be condemned at the mouth of witnesses, and even so, only if they have been warned and told that they are liable to the penalty of death in the court. R. Jose, the son of Jehuda, says : They must also be told what manner of death they will incur. No matter whether all or only some of the witnesses warn him, he is guilty ; but R. Jose would acquit unless all his witnesses warn him, for it is written : At the mouth of two witnesses (Deut. xvii. 6), that is, until two witnesses warn together ; though R. Jose allows that if the first witness warned him and then went away, and the second warned him and then went away, the man would be liable to the penalty.’ [1] The method of procedure is almost the same as in the gospel, save that for the Jews the intention is evil, but for the follower of Jesus good.

In the gospel there follows, ‘ Verily I say unto you, What things soever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven : and what things soever ye shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven ’ (xviii. 18). The phraseology is distinctively Jewish, binding and loosing being the words used of the decisions of the rabbis who forbade or permitted certain things. ‘ R. Jochanan said : Why have ye brought this elder to me ? Whatsoever I loose, he binds ; whatsoever I bind, he looses.’ [2]

[1] T. xi. 1.

[2] *Betzah*, fol. 60a.

'Thou shalt neither bind nor loose.'[1] Very many examples could be quoted. Frequently the schools of Shammai and Hillel took opposite views. 'Of the disciples of Shammai and those of Hillel, the one bound, and the other loosed.'[2] 'The school of Shammai binds . . . the school of Hillel looses.'[3] The disciples were to make decisions comparable with those of the scribes.

The gospel continues: 'Again I say unto you, that if two of you shall agree on earth as touching anything that they shall ask, it shall be done for them of my Father which is in heaven. For where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them' (xviii. 19–20). The latter part is clearly based on a Jewish saying, 'Two sit together and are occupied with the words of the *Torah*, there is the *Shekinah* among them.'[4] It is, as we have seen, a common Jewish rule that a company of three can represent the whole body. 'Non-capital cases are to be tried by three judges; but according to Rabbi they are to be tried by five, so that the decision may be supported by three. Arbitration may be effected by three—so R. Meir; but the majority hold that one suffices. The *Semika* (ordination) is to be decided by three, and the laying on of the elders' hands (Lev. iv. 15) by three.'[5] 'Every council of three in Israel is like the council of Moses.'[6] The Christian community possesses the rights and privileges of the Jewish church.

The saying about binding and loosing is found also earlier, with an addition, in our Lord's promise to Peter. 'I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven' (xvi. 19). We compare the promise to Eliakim: 'And I will give unto him the key of the house of David upon his

[1] *Betzah*, fols. 60a, 63a.

[2] *Yebam.*, T. i.

[3] *Terumoth*, v. 4; *Pes.* iv. 5; *Shabbath*, fol. 4a, 16b; *Betz.*, fol. 61a.

[4] *Aboth*, iii. 3.

[5] *Sanh.*, T. i. 1.

[6] *Rosh ha-shanah*, ii. 9, fol. 25a.

shoulder; and he shall open, and there shall be none to shut; and he shall shut, and there shall be none to open' (Is. xxii. 22). The gospel statement is clearly based on that of the prophet. 'The house of David' is interpreted as meaning the kingdom of heaven. Luke shews the connexion: 'The Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David: and he shall reign over the house of Jacob for ever; and of his kingdom there shall be no end' (i. 32–33). So, too, the shutting and opening have suggested the binding and loosing. Like the shutting and opening the binding and loosing are a result of the possession of the keys, which thus symbolize the authority to bind and loose. The binding and loosing are to be interpreted of the authoritative decisions of Peter the 'elder' (I. Pet. v. 1), as of the Jewish elders. Eliakim was the steward of the house of David. Moses was a steward of whom God said, 'He is faithful in all mine house' (Num. xii. 7). The keys of the kingdom of heaven must likewise therefore be interpreted of the functions of an elder who is over the house of God. They do not represent an additional prerogative, distinct from binding and loosing.

In the description of the last supper we meet with another grade of disciples. 'And he sent Peter and John, saying, Go and make ready for us the passover, that we may eat. And they said unto him, Where wilt thou that we make ready? And he said unto them, Behold, when ye are entered into the city, there shall meet you a man bearing a pitcher of water; follow him into the house whereinto he goeth. And ye shall say unto the householder of the house, The Master saith unto thee, Where is the guest-chamber, where I shall eat the passover with my disciples? And he will show you a large upper room furnished: there make ready. . . . And when the hour was come, he sat down, and the apostles with him. . . . And there arose also a contention among them, which of them is accounted to be greatest. And he said unto them . . .

He that is the greater among you, let him become as the younger; and he that is the leader, as he that doth serve. For whether is greater, he that sitteth at meat, or he that serveth ? is not he that sitteth at meat ? but I am in the midst of you as he that serveth ' (Luke xxii. 8–12, 14, 24–27).

The reference to 'the householder' suggests also 'them of his household' (Matt. x. 25), members of the family, or 'servants' (Matt. xiii. 27, xxi. 33; Luke xiv. 21), or even 'labourers' (Matt. xx. 1). The man bearing the pitcher of water was apparently a slave or servant of the house, for the drawing of water was regarded as a menial task (Deut. xxix. 11; Jos. ix. 21, 23, 27). The householder was evidently a disciple of Jesus who recognised Him as 'the Master,' or 'the Teacher.' 'The Master saith unto thee, Where is the guest chamber ?' We notice that the words are not 'our Master,' which might limit the discipleship to Peter and John (cf. Matt. ix. 11, x. 25, xvii. 24, xxiii. 8; Luke vi. 40), but 'the Master,' which must be taken as including the householder in it. The saying added in Matthew, 'My time is at hand' (xxvi. 18), would be meaningless on any other hypothesis. There must have been many such disciples in Jerusalem and the neighbourhood. We see another in the owner of the colt on which Jesus made His triumphant entry into the city, to whom it was sufficient to say, 'The Lord hath need of him' (Luke xix. 34).

It is plain that Jesus had already made His arrangements with the householder, and had engaged his guest-chamber for the paschal feast. It is mentioned as already set apart and furnished for the use of Jesus and His company. Mark makes it quite plain that it is His, for we read, 'Where is my guest chamber ?' (xiv. 14). The householder was expecting the inquiry, the house and the household were ready, all were awaiting the arrival of the Master and the twelve.

An important person at a Jewish feast was the attendant, or servant. The Talmud has much to say about him, particularly when he is and when he is not to be included in the company.

'When two companies eat their paschal sacrifice in the same house . . . the waiter or servant must close his mouth while he waits on the other company to pour out wine for them; then he must turn his face towards the company he eats with, and he must not eat till he rejoins his own company.'[1]

'The schoolmen inquired whether the servant in the house of his master must recline or not. Come and hear: R. Jehoshua ben Levi said: If the servant ate unleavened bread to the size of an olive in a reclining position, he has fulfilled his duty. Whence we may infer that the servant must also recline.'[2]

'Three who ate together are under the obligation to give an invitation to grace . . . and the attendant who has eaten food the size of an olive and the Samaritan may be included for the invitation . . . and the attendant who has eaten less than the size of an olive, and the idolator may not be included for the invitation.'[3]

'The attendant who was waiting upon two men should eat with them, even if they did not give him permission. If he waited upon three, he should only eat with them when they give him permission.'[4]

At a Jewish feast there were also various rules with regard to precedence among the guests, particularly with regard to the order of reclining and the order of washing hands. The details are given in the Talmud: 'What is the order of reclining? . . . When there are three couches the eldest reclines at the head of the middle one, the second to him above him, the third to him below him. . . . The order of washing hands—how is it arranged? Up to the number of five they begin with the eldest; from five and onwards they begin with the youngest.'[5]

---

[1] *Pes.* vii. 13.
[2] On Bab. *Pes.* x. 1, p. 226.
[3] *Ber.* vii. 1.
[4] Bab. *Ber.* vii. 1, fol. 45a; T. v. 10.
[5] *Ber.* T. v. 5–6.

Perhaps now we shall be better able to understand our Lord's words: 'He that is the greater among you, let him become as the younger; and he that is the leader, as he that doth serve. For whether is greater, he that sitteth at meat, or he that serveth ? is not he that sitteth at meat ? but I am in the midst of you as he that serveth' (Luke xxii. 26–27). There is, we notice, a threefold comparison, but apparently there are only two sets of people compared, 'the greater' with 'the younger,' 'the leader' and 'he that doth serve,' 'he that sitteth at meat' and 'he that serveth.' The comparison is not between the chief and the least of the apostles, but between the apostles, particularly the chief of them, and the young man who is acting as servant. The attendant is plainly distinguished from the guests. The argument would have been impossible if one of the apostles had been acting as waiter. We are told indeed that Jesus 'sat down, and the apostles with him' (xxii. 14). There is also a hidden reference to the attendant as distinct from the apostles in the statement that 'he received a cup, and . . . said, Take this, and divide it among yourselves' (xxii. 17).

According to the fourth gospel Jesus gave the same lesson also in action. 'He riseth from supper, and layeth aside his garments; and he took a towel, and girded himself. Then he poureth water into the bason, and began to wash the disciples' feet, and to wipe them with the towel wherewith he was girded. . . . So when he had washed their feet, and taken his garments, and sat down again, he said unto them, Know ye what I have done to you ? Ye call me, Master, and, Lord: and ye say well; for so I am. If I then, the Lord and the Master, have washed your feet, ye also ought to wash one another's feet. For I have given you an example, that ye also should do as I have done to you' (xiii. 4–5, 12–15). In John as well as in Luke Jesus at the last supper is 'the Master,' or 'the Teacher,' and it is as their Teacher that He gives the object lesson to His disciples. The action confirms the view that no one of the apostles has been acting as attendant, for had this been so it would have been unnecessary.

'The greater' of the apostles of whom Jesus speaks must be St. Peter, who is the chief 'leader.' Later Jesus said to him, 'Simon, Simon . . . do thou, when once thou hast turned again, stablish thy brethren' (Luke xxii. 31–32). Peter's name, we remember, is the first, on each of the lists of the twelve apostles, 'the first, Simon, who is called Peter' (Matt. x. 2; Mark iii. 16; Luke vi. 14; Acts i. 13). At the washing of the disciples' feet it is not until last, we gather, that 'he cometh to Simon Peter' (John xiii. 6), according to the Talmud, it would seem, a token of his preeminence. Similarly the Talmud makes it plain that the second guest was the beloved disciple who sat on Jesus' right: 'There was at the table reclining in Jesus' bosom one of his disciples, whom Jesus loved' (John xiii. 23). 'He that is the leader' and 'he that sitteth at meat,' being alike contrasted with 'him that serveth,' must be identical. The twelve are brought before us as the 'leaders' among the disciples. 'The younger' is apparently not the youngest disciple of the guests, but the 'young man' who is serving. St. John, it would seem, was the youngest of the twelve, yet he sat in the second place of honour. 'The younger' is a synonym for 'the young man,' and is practically equivalent to servant. So St. Luke uses the words, 'The younger men arose and wrapped him round' (Acts v. 6). 'The young men came in and found her dead' (v. 10). The equivalence is very common in the Old Testament, though it is expressed in various words: 'Her nobles have sent their younger men for water' (Jer. xiv. 3); 'Save only what things the young men have eaten' (Gen. xiv. 24); 'Abraham said to his boys' (Gen. xxii. 5); 'Boaz charged his youths' (Ruth ii. 15); with many other examples. In the gospel of St. Luke the parallel to 'the younger' is 'he that serveth.' Mark, who, as frequently, has moved the saying from its proper context, generalises our Lord's words and gives the noun: 'Whosoever would become great among you shall be your minister (deacon) . . . For verily the Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister' (x. 43, 45). And again, 'If any man would be first, he shall be last of all, and minister (deacon) of all' (ix. 35).

In each of the gospels in the account of the last supper the idea of Jesus as 'the Master' or 'Teacher' is emphasised. It is as Teacher that He likens Himself to the attendant, giving an object lesson to the apostles. The suggestion is that the servant as well as the apostles belonged to the ranks of Jesus' disciples. It is inconceivable, indeed, that it should have been otherwise, for it was the privilege of the young man who acted as waiter on this occasion to perform the office of deacon at the celebration of the first Christian eucharist, that is, at the sacrificial inauguration of the new covenant. We remember that in the account of the sacrifice at the inauguration of the old covenant on mount Sinai there were duties for 'the young men,' as well as for 'the elders.' 'And he sent forth the young men of the children of Israel, and they offered whole burnt offerings, and they sacrificed young calves as a peace offering to God' (Exod. xxiv. 5). The chief of the young men was Joshua, 'And Moses rose up, and Joshua his attendant' (Exod. xxiv. 13); 'his servant Joshua, the son of Nun, a young man' (xxxiii. 11). We notice that the Hebrew word translated 'servant,' which is commonly used of Joshua (Exod. xxiv. 13, xxxiii. 11; Num. xi. 28; Jos. i. 1), is that used in the book of Esther to describe the seven chamberlains of king Ahasuerus, the seven 'deacons' according to the Septuagint (i. 10, ii. 2, vi. 3). Joshua the servant of Moses, we remember, according to both Josephus and the Talmud, was also his 'disciple.'[1]

---

[1] See pp. 32–33.

To wait at table is properly the work of a servant. 'Who is there of you, having a bondservant plowing or keeping sheep, that will say unto him, when he is come in from the field, Come straightway and sit down to meat; and will not rather say unto him, Make ready wherewith I may sup, and gird thyself, and serve me, till I have eaten and drunken?' (Luke xvii. 7–8). It was a mark of the highest honour conceivable for a master to wait upon his servants. 'Blessed are those bondservants, whom the lord when he cometh shall find watching: verily I say unto you, that he shall gird himself, and make them sit down to meat, and shall come and serve them' (xii. 37). As a sign of courtesy to an honoured guest it was not unusual for the host to perform some at any rate of the ordinary acts of service himself. For such neglect Jesus upbraided Simon: 'I entered into thine house, thou gavest me no water for my feet . . . My head with oil thou didst not anoint' (vii. 44, 46). At Bethany six days before the passover we are told 'they made him a supper there: and Martha served' (John xii. 2). It was on this matter of service that the difference arose between Martha and Mary: 'Martha was cumbered about much serving; and she came up to him, and said, Lord, dost thou not care that my sister did leave me to serve alone? bid her therefore that she help me' (Luke x. 40).

At the last supper, therefore, to shew honour to Jesus and His disciples the probability is that the householder himself, or one of his household, acted as servant and waited. It was as 'the Master' from the disciple that Jesus requested the use of the guest-chamber. It is unlikely, therefore, that the householder would allow the Master to be served merely by a slave or hired servant. To whomsoever 'the younger' and 'he that serveth' may refer, the man who was the bearer of the pitcher of water, being presumably a menial of some sort, would seem to be excluded from so high an office. It is unlikely that the host himself acted as attendant on this occasion, for however youthful he might be in fact he would hardly be described as 'the younger' in this connexion, and in his own house he would be too important a person to make our Lord's contrast with its assumption of the inferiority of the waiter at all possible. That he was the son of the householder seems the most probable hypothesis.

At a quite early date, as we see from the account of the death of Ananias, there was a body of young men who acted as servants of the Christian community, and its nucleus may well be looked for in our Lord's own day. The expression 'the younger' used of a servant of the disciples is found only in these two passages in the New Testament, which suggests that St. Luke intended to imply a connexion. Certainly at a quite early period there were women who ministered to Jesus and the twelve. 'He went about through cities and villages, preaching and bringing the good tidings of the kingdom of God, and with him the twelve, and certain women . . . which ministered unto them of their substance' (Luke viii. 1–3); 'There were also women . . . who, when he was in Galilee, followed him, and ministered unto him' (Mark xv. 40–41).

Disciples of Jesus, if not numerous, were by no means uncommon in Jerusalem and the neighbourhood. The owner of the ass at Bethphage has been mentioned, and Peter's question to our Lord, 'Where wilt thou that we make ready?' (Luke xxii. 9) shews the existence of a number of potential hosts for the paschal feast. In this circle of disciples there must have been young men, and from them must have been drawn, in part at any rate, the band of 'younger men,' or 'young men,' whom we meet with holding an established position in the life of the church in the story of Ananias.

The existence of such a body of young disciples is exactly what we should expect from our study of Jewish customs, and the practice of the great rabbis and doctors of the law. It is inconceivable that a teacher of eminence would be without youthful followers, the disciples of the wise, whose duty it would be to minister to their master. This was a rabbinical rule. 'Even if one has studied *Torah* and *Mishnah*, but has not ministered to the disciples of the wise, he is a man of the earth,' to minister to disciples of the wise being explained as to 'minister to the rabbis.'[1] One such young disciple of Jesus we know, the young man who served the Master and His apostles at the last supper. There is thus evidence that our Lord recognised among His followers another and lower order of workers than the twelve or seventy, whose duty was to serve.

It is not improbable that we may identify the young man even more precisely. The question to the householder was, 'Where is the guest-chamber, where I shall eat the passover with my disciples?' And we are told that it was 'a large upper room' (Luke xxii. 11–12). Jesus entered into possession apparently the evening before the passover: 'He sat down, and the apostles with him' (xxii. 14). It was evidently intended to be the temporary residence of the Master and His twelve apostles. On the first Easter Day we are told the two disciples returned from Emmaus to Jerusalem, 'and found the eleven gathered together, and them that were with them' (xxiv. 33). The probability is that it was in the 'large upper room' in which the last supper had been held. After the ascension we read that the apostles returned to Jerusalem. 'And when they were come in, they went up into the upper chamber, where they were abiding' (Acts i. 13). This 'upper chamber' was thus the residence of the eleven, and the natural assumption is that it was identical with the 'large upper room' which was the original lodging place of the twelve. Later when Peter was delivered from prison we are told 'he came to the house of Mary the mother of John whose surname was Mark; where many were gathered together' (xii. 12). The most natural place to which he would betake himself in the circumstances would be his former residence, and that it was such gives the most adequate explanation of the fact that the maid Rhoda 'opened not the gate for joy' (xii. 14), and that afterwards 'he departed, and went to another place' (xii. 17), his old lodging being no longer safe.

---

[1] Bab. *Ber.* vii. 1, fol. 47b. See p. 34.

At Peter's original place of residence in Jerusalem there was a young man who served at the last supper. At his last place of residence in Jerusalem there is a man, clearly not very old, 'John, whose surname was Mark.' In his epistle Peter calls him 'Mark my son' (I. v. 13), a description not suitable for a convert, who would be a 'child,' like Timothy (I. Tim. i. 2, 18; II. Tim. i. 2, ii. 1), Titus (Tit. i. 4), and Onesimus (Philem. 10) to St. Paul, but singularly appropriate for one who had lived with him as a member of the same household. The presumption is that the young attendant at the last supper and John Mark are one. The lapse of years is sufficient explanation of the fact that now we hear nothing of 'the householder,' and that the house is 'the house of Mary the mother of John whose surname was Mark,' evidently a widow. If this identification is correct, we find Mark still engaged in the same sort of work a little later: 'Barnabas and Saul returned from Jerusalem . . . taking with them John whose surname was Mark . . . and they had also John as their attendant' (Acts xii. 25, xiii. 5). At a later date he is still the servant of the apostles, for St. Paul writes to Timothy: 'Take Mark, and bring him with thee: for he is useful to me for ministering' (II. iv. 11). As at the last supper, though no longer so young a man, he is still serving, doing the work of a deacon. His relationship to St. Paul is very similar to that of 'his minister Joshua' (Exod. xxxiii. 11) to Moses.

The organisation of the new people of God, of the kingdom of God on earth, is thus complete. We have in Jesus the new Moses with the great council of the seventy elders with its inner group of twelve. We see also the young men like Joshua, the servants of the embryo church, the deacons. The great work of Jesus in the days of His flesh was to set up this new organisation and educate and appoint the first officers. The kingdom of God is not an idea but an institution with officers and an organisation appointed and commissioned by the Master. Yet not until after the ascension did the hour come for it to function. Even after the resurrection there were still many instructions to give, which would have been impossible before. He shewed Himself alive to the apostles, ‘ appearing unto them by the space of forty days, and speaking the things concerning the kingdom of God ’ (Acts i. 3). ‘ He charged them not to depart from Jerusalem, but to wait for the promise of the Father, which, said he, ye heard from me. . . . They asked him, saying, Lord, dost thou at this time restore the kingdom to Israel ? ’ (i. 4, 6).

The request of the disciples did not betoken so foolish a view of the kingdom as is commonly supposed. Jesus, indeed, accepted their idea of the kingdom as generally correct, merely explaining that they must not expect to know the hour. ‘ It is not for you to know times or seasons, which the Father hath set within his own authority. But ye shall receive power, when the Holy Ghost is come upon you : and ye shall be my witnesses both in Jerusalem, and in all Judæa and Samaria, and unto the uttermost part of the earth ’ (i. 7–8).

When the disciples were assembled for the election of a successor to Judas, St. Luke tells us : ‘ There was a multitude of persons gathered together, about a hundred and twenty ’ (i. 15). Among them must have been those followers of Jesus of whom St. Peter speaks as possessing the qualifications necessary for apostleship, ‘ the men which have companied with us all the time that the Lord Jesus went in and went out among us, beginning from the baptism of John, unto the day that he was received up from us ' (i. 21–22). Chief of the company would be the eleven apostles, and presumably it included the seventy also, for these certainly had companied with the apostles. Theirs had been as definite appointment to office as that of the twelve, and as the charge makes plain, to very similar duties. ' Now after these things the Lord appointed seventy others, and sent them two and two before his face into every city and place, whither he himself was about to come ' (Luke x. 1). A little before Luke had told us : ' When the days were well-nigh come that he should be received up, he stedfastly set his face to go to Jerusalem, and sent messengers before his face ' (ix. 51–52). This mission was apparently preliminary to that of the seventy. Luke so arranges his narrative that the ministry of Jesus is put before us as one long journey to Jerusalem. We can hardly suppose that Jerusalem was the only city to which the seventy did not precede Him to prepare the way. The elders of the new people of God would be present, we must suppose, on so important an occasion as the election of a new apostle. Among the hundred and twenty the ' multitude of names ' would include the seventy of whom Jesus said the ' names are written in heaven ' (x. 20). The appearance of the word ' names ' to describe the disciples on this occasion is not without significance, and links the hundred and twenty with the seventy, and indeed with the seventy elders in the wilderness, where likewise we find emphasis on names. ' There remained two men in the camp, the name of the one was Eldad, and the name of the other Medad . . . and they were of them that were written ' (Num. xi. 26).

The hundred and twenty were regarded as belonging to a definite body chosen by Jesus Himself, to different members and sections of which He had allotted different duties. So St. Peter says of Judas, ' He was numbered among us, and received his portion in this ministry '

(Acts i. 17). This is likewise the point of the second quotation from the psalter, ‘His office let another take’ (i. 20; Ps. cix. 8). The person to be chosen was ‘to take the place in this ministry and apostleship, from which Judas fell away’ (i. 25). Any disciples of whom it could be said that they had companied with the apostles all the time that the Lord Jesus went in and out among them must have been exceptionally distinguished, and there could scarcely have been many such who were not included in the seventy. There is nothing in the gospel to suggest that the twelve were appointed to a permanent but the seventy to a temporary office, the duties assigned being largely identical. All, whether of the twelve or seventy or others, who had been chosen to do the Master's work in whatever office, would need the power from on high, and must therefore have been among those who tarried at Jerusalem to wait for the promise of the Father. Any idea that the disciples thought that the imminence of the day of the Lord made it unnecessary to give attention to matters of organisation, as we are sometimes told, is clearly quite contrary to the evidence.

CHAPTER II

THE SPIRIT AND THE NEW ORGANISATION

THE outpouring of the Spirit was not upon the twelve only, but upon the whole body of believers. ‘And when the day of Pentecost was now come, they were all together in one place. And suddenly there came from heaven a sound as of the rushing of a mighty wind, and it filled all the house where they were sitting. And there appeared unto them tongues parting asunder, like as of fire; and it sat upon each of them. And they were all filled with the Holy Spirit, and began to speak with other tongues, as the Spirit gave them utterance’ (Acts ii. 1–4).

St. Peter, we find, had not been so inapt a pupil in the things concerning the kingdom of God and the promise of the Father, of which they had heard from Jesus. He has the explanation ready: ‘This is that which hath been spoken by the prophet Joel; And it shall be in the last days, saith God, I will pour forth of my Spirit upon all flesh: And your sons and your daughters shall prophesy, and your young men shall see visions, and your elders shall dream dreams: Yea and on my bondservants and on my bondmaidens in those days will I pour forth of my Spirit; and they shall prophesy’ (ii. 16–18; Joel ii. 28–29).

Has the significance of this quotation been fully appreciated? The book of Joel is built up largely of quotations, and it is true of the passage given by Peter. The words ‘I will pour forth of my Spirit upon all flesh’ were doubtless suggested by Ezekiel, ‘I have poured out my spirit upon the house of Israel' (xxxix. 29), but for the rest it is based almost entirely on the Pentateuch, on the various accounts of the bestowal of the Holy Ghost on the people of God in days of old, which apparently in the view of the prophet were only foreshadowings of what was to be in the last days.

'Would God that all the Lord's people were prophets, that the Lord would put his spirit upon them!' (Num. xi. 29). So spake Moses when the Holy Ghost came on the seventy elders. In fulfilment we have the promise of the Father, 'I will pour forth of my Spirit upon all flesh.'

Moses had prayed, 'Let the Lord, the God of the spirits of all flesh, appoint a man over the congregation' (Num. xxvii. 16). The answer was, 'Take thee Joshua the son of Nun, a man in whom is the spirit, and lay thine hand upon him' (xxvii. 18). 'And Joshua the son of Nun was full of the spirit of wisdom; for Moses had laid his hands upon him' (Deut. xxxiv. 9). Joshua is the chosen representative of 'all flesh,' and the filling of his spirit with a higher spirit foreshadows the pouring of the Spirit on 'all flesh,' which is the promise of the Father.

Mention of 'your sons and your daughters' as recipients of divine favours under the old covenant is common in the Pentateuch (Exod. iii. 22, x. 9, xxxii. 2; Lev. x. 14; Num. xviii. 11, 19; Deut. xii. 12), so that it is natural that they should be mentioned in a prophecy of the new covenant, 'your sons and your daughters shall prophesy.'

At Sinai we read of the 'young men' (Exod. xxiv. 5), and particularly of the 'young man' Joshua, who 'went up into the mount of God' with Moses (xxiv. 13, xxxiii. 11), and of 'the elders' who 'saw the God of Israel' (Exod. xxiv. 9). The promise to Aaron and Miriam was, 'If there be a prophet among you, I the Lord will make myself known unto him in a vision, I will speak unto him in a dream' (Num. xii. 6). The promise of the Father through Joel combines the type and prophecy, 'And your young men shall see visions, and your elders shall dream dreams.'

Joshua is 'the servant of Moses,' but also, like Moses, 'the bondservant of the Lord' (Jos. xxiv. 29; Jud. ii. 8; cf. Jos. xiv. 7). We read, 'And the Lord said unto Moses, Take thee Joshua the son of Nun, a man in whom is the spirit, and lay thine hand upon him. . . . And thou shalt put of thy majesty upon him, that all the congregation of the children of Israel may obey' (Num. xxvii. 18, 20). When Moses chose the seventy elders, we are told, 'The Lord . . . took of the spirit that was upon him, and put it upon the seventy elders' (Num. xi. 25). The thought is the same. 'The majesty' of Moses is the expression of the glory of the *Shekinah*, which is the source of 'the spirit.' We are told 'when Moses came down from mount Sinai with the two tables of the testimony in Moses' hand,' after his interview with God, that 'the skin of his face sent forth beams by reason of his speaking with him.' 'And when Aaron and all the children of Israel saw Moses, behold, the skin of his face sent forth beams . . . and he gave them in commandment all that the Lord had spoken with him in mount Sinai' (Exod. xxxiv. 29–32). 'And they said, All that the Lord hath spoken will we do, and be obedient' (Exod. xxiv. 7). This is 'the majesty' which is to be put upon Joshua, 'that all the congregation of the children of Israel may obey.' It is the bestowal of 'the spirit' of Moses and of God upon 'the bondservant of the Lord.'

When Joshua, as taught by Moses, stood before Eleazar before the Lord, the prophetic action was divided. Eleazar received the word, but Joshua uttered it. 'He shall stand before Eleazar the priest, who shall inquire for him by the judgment of the Urim before the Lord: at his word shall they go out, and at his word they shall come in, both he, and all the children of Israel with him, even all the congregation' (Num. xxvii. 21). Josephus says: 'Moses taught them also . . . how they should go forth to war, making use of the stones for their direction. . . . Joshua also prophesied while Moses was present.'[1] In the fulfilment of the type, when all the Lord's people will be prophets, the gift will be complete for each and general. This is the promise of the Father. 'Yea and on my bondservants and on my bondmaidens in those days will I pour forth of my Spirit; and they shall prophesy.'

The promise of the Father by Joel is a prophecy of the generalisation of the gifts of the Spirit to the seventy elders and to Joshua, the 'young man,' 'the servant of Moses,' 'the bondservant of the Lord,' for the benefit of 'all flesh,' of 'the sons and the daughters,' of 'all the Lord's people.' 'And the Lord came down in the cloud, and spake unto him, and took of the spirit that was upon him, and put it upon the seventy elders; and it came to pass, that, when the spirit rested upon them, they prophesied' (Num. xi. 25). 'And the Lord said unto Moses, Take thee Joshua the son of Nun, a man in whom is the spirit, and lay thine hand upon him. . . . And thou shalt put of thine honour upon him. . . . At his word shall they go out, and at his word they shall come in' (Num. xxvii. 18–21). 'And Joshua the son of Nun was full of the spirit of wisdom; for Moses had laid his hands upon him' (Deut. xxxiv. 9). 'It shall be in the last days, said God, I will pour forth of my Spirit upon all flesh: and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy, and your young men shall see visions, and your elders shall dream dreams: Yea and on my bondservants and on my bondmaidens in those days will I pour forth of my Spirit; and they shall prophesy.'

There will be a new dispensation of the Spirit, more perfect than that of Sinai, as the fulfilment is greater than the type. On Sinai God manifested Himself amid mighty portents, and these will be repeated at the inauguration of the new covenant. ‘There were thunders and lightnings, and a thick cloud upon the mount, and the voice of a trumpet exceeding loud; and all the people that were in the camp trembled. . . . And mount Sinai was altogether on smoke, because the Lord descended upon it in fire: and the smoke thereof ascended as the smoke of a furnace, and the whole mount quaked greatly. . . . And all the people saw the thunderings, and the lightnings, and the voice of the trumpet, and the mountain smoking: and when the people saw it, they trembled, and stood afar off . . . and Moses drew near unto the thick darkness where God was. . . . And the appearance of the glory of the Lord was like devouring fire on the top of the mount in the eyes of the children of Israel’ (Exod. xix. 16, 18, xx. 18, 21, xxiv. 17). ‘And I will shew wonders in the heaven above, and signs on the earth beneath; blood, and fire, and vapour of smoke: the sun shall be turned into darkness, and the moon into blood, before the day of the Lord come, that great and notable day’ (Acts ii. 19–20; Joel ii. 28–31).

---

[1] *Ant.* IV. viii. 46.

The great desire of the risen Jesus was that His disciples should understand the scriptures concerning Himself, and in particular the promise of the Father concerning the new covenant and the kingdom of God. This was the burden of His teaching on the first Easter Day and afterwards. ‘Beginning from Moses and from all the prophets, he interpreted to them in all the scriptures the things concerning himself. . . . All things must needs be fulfilled, which are written in the law of Moses, and the prophets, and the psalms, concerning me. Then opened he their mind, that they might understand the scriptures; and he said unto them, Thus it is written. . . . And behold, I send forth the promise of my Father upon you: but tarry ye in the city, until ye be clothed with power from on high’ (Luke xxiv. 27, 44–46, 49). ‘He shewed himself alive after his passion by many proofs, appearing unto them by the space of forty days, and speaking the things concerning the kingdom of God: and, being assembled together with them, he charged them not to depart from Jerusalem, but to wait for the promise of the Father, which, said he, ye heard from me' (Acts i. 3–4). Peter's exposition of the prophecy was not something which occurred to him on the spur of the moment. It must have been part of the teaching received from Jesus, the promise of the Father being specially singled out as one of the things they had heard from Him. This alone explains the argument of Peter's speech. 'This is that which hath been spoken by the prophet Joel. . . . This Jesus . . . having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Ghost, hath poured forth this, which ye see and hear' (Acts ii. 16, 32–33).

On the day of Pentecost there was a fulfilment not only of the prophecy of Joel, but of the outpourings of the spirit, 'written in the law of Moses' which Joel used as types for the framework of his prophecy. Even the details of the prophecy have their application in the new dispensation of the Spirit, in the new covenant inaugurated by the new Moses. This thought of Jesus as the new Moses is the background of Peter's speech. The story of Moses is full of references to 'the signs and the wonders' which he did, 'before your eyes,' 'before our eyes,' 'which thine eyes saw,' 'in the midst of Egypt,' 'in the midst of all Israel,' 'in the sight of all Israel' (Exod. vii. 3, xi. 9, 10; Deut. iv. 34, vi. 22, vii. 19, xi. 3, xxvi. 8, xxviii. 46, xxix. 2–3, xxxiv. 11), the two words, 'signs' and 'wonders,' appearing sometimes in the Septuagint where only one is found in the Hebrew. 'And there hath not arisen a prophet since in Israel like unto Moses, whom the Lord knew face to face; in all the signs and the wonders, which the Lord sent him to do in the land of Egypt . . . and in all the mighty hand . . . which Moses wrought in the sight of all Israel' (Deut. xxxiv. 10–12). Peter's description of Jesus is very similar: 'Jesus of Nazareth, a man approved of God unto you by mighty works and wonders and signs, which God did by him in the midst of you, even as ye yourselves know' (Acts ii. 22). Stephen gives a like description of Moses and then proceeds to tell of the new Moses, Jesus: 'This man led them forth, having wrought wonders and signs in Egypt, and in the Red Sea, and in the wilderness forty years. This is that Moses, which said unto the children of Israel, A prophet shall God raise up unto you from among your brethren, like unto me' (Acts vii. 36–37). This fact, revealed to Peter and the two other apostles at the transfiguration, is one of the foundation truths of Christianity, and Peter himself quotes the prophecy after the healing of the lame man. 'Repent ye therefore . . . that he may send the Christ who hath been appointed for you, even Jesus. . . . Moses indeed said, A prophet shall the Lord God raise up unto you from among your brethren, like unto me; to him shall ye hearken in all things whatsoever he shall speak unto you' (Acts iii. 19–22). Peter's explanation of the gift of the Holy Ghost on the day of Pentecost is based on this identification. Moses partaking of the glory of the *Shekinah* through communion with God, gives of his 'majesty' to Joshua, God Himself taking of his spirit, the Spirit of God which was upon him, and putting it on the seventy elders. So, too, Jesus 'being by the right hand of God exalted, and having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Ghost, hath poured forth this, which ye see and hear' (ii. 33). What was poured forth was not merely the Spirit of God, but the Spirit of Jesus, part of His own endowment.

When Moses came down from mount Sinai, also when he came forth from before the Lord, 'the skin of his face sent forth horns' or 'beams.' He partakes of the glory of God as this is described elsewhere. 'And his brightness was as the light; he had horns (or beams) coming forth from his hand' (Hab. iii. 4). 'He shined forth from mount Paran. . . . At his right hand was fire, a law unto them' (Deut. xxxiii. 2). It was from this lustre of the *Shekinah* that the 'majesty,' the 'glory' according to the Septuagint, was given to Joshua, and the Spirit rested on the seventy elders. So when Jesus was revealed as the new Moses on the mountain 'the fashion of his countenance was altered, and his raiment became white and dazzling' (Luke ix. 29). 'His face did shine as the sun' (Matt. xvii. 2). The apostles 'saw his glory,' yet this was only a temporary anticipation. Not until after the passion could the Christ permanently 'enter into his glory' (Luke xxiv. 26). From this glory Jesus, 'at the right hand of God exalted,' poured forth His Spirit. To the Jews of our Lord's time the feast of Pentecost was a commemoration of the giving of the law on Sinai. The portents at the giving of the Holy Ghost on the day of Pentecost are those of mount Sinai, and of the outpourings of the Spirit upon the elders and Joshua which followed. 'And when the day of Pentecost was now come, they were all together in one place. . . . And there appeared unto them tongues parting asunder, like as of fire; and it sat upon each one of them. And they were all filled with the Holy Spirit, and began to speak with other tongues, as the Spirit gave them utterance' (Acts ii. 1, 3–4).

As the prophet like unto Moses Jesus is the new Elijah as well as the new Moses. On the mount of transfiguration, 'Behold, there talked with him two men, which were Moses and Elijah; who appeared in glory' (Luke ix. 30–31). Our Lord, not John the Baptist, is the second Elijah, as He Himself afterwards claimed. 'And he said unto them, Elijah indeed cometh first, and restoreth all things: and how is it written of the Son of man, that he should suffer many things and be set at nought? But I say unto you, that Elijah is come, and they have also done unto him whatsoever they listed, even as it is written of him' (Mark ix. 12–13). John Baptist, who went before His face 'in the spirit and power of Elijah' (Luke i. 17), is Elisha, who 'was filled with his spirit' (Ecclus. xlviii. 12), for 'they said, The spirit of Elijah doth rest on Elisha' (II. Kings ii. 15), and like Elisha John required baptism in Jordan (Luke iii. 3; cf. II. Kings v. 10, 14).

For both Moses and Elijah on the mount of God the glory of God passed by. 'And it shall come to pass, while my glory passeth by, that I will put thee in a cleft of the rock, and will cover thee with my hand until I have passed by' (Exod. xxxiii. 22). 'Go forth, and stand upon the mount before the Lord. And, behold, the Lord passed by, and a great and strong wind rent the mountains, and brake in pieces the rocks before the Lord; but the Lord was not in the wind: and after the wind an earthquake; but the Lord was not in the earthquake: and after the earthquake a fire; but the Lord was not in the fire: and after the fire a still small voice' (I. Kings xix. 11–12). On the day of Pentecost and afterwards both these incidents, as types, received fulfilment, and so the visit of Elijah to the mount of God, as well as that of Moses, is drawn upon for the description of the signs of that day, to which for completeness we must add details from the description of another meeting of the brethren in the Spirit. 'And when the day of Pentecost was now come, they were all together in one place. And suddenly there came from heaven a sound as of the rushing of a mighty wind, and it filled all the house where they were sitting. And there appeared unto them tongues parting asunder, like as of fire; and it sat upon each one of them. . . . And . . . the place was shaken wherein they were gathered together; and they were all filled with the Holy Ghost' (Acts ii. 1–4, iv. 31).

The day of Pentecost provided not merely a fulfilment of the words of Joel but a fulfilment also, as we have seen, of the types which Joel used as the basis of his prophecy.

In the type Moses said: 'Would God that all the

Lord's people were prophets, that the Lord would put his spirit upon them ! ' (Num. xi. 29). The prophecy says, ' I will pour forth of my Spirit upon all flesh, and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy ' (Acts ii. 17 ; Joel ii. 28). In the fulfilment ' They were all together in one place. . . . And they were all filled with the Holy Spirit ' (Acts ii. 1, 4).

In the type God commanded Moses, ' the skin of (whose) face sent forth beams,' to take ' his minister, Joshua, the son of Nun, a young man,' ' the bondservant of the Lord,' and ' lay thine hand upon him. . . . And thou shalt put of thy majesty (or glory) upon him ' (Exod. xxxiv. 29 ; Num. xxvii. 18, 20 ; Exod. xxxiii. 11; Jos. xxiv. 29). The prophecy says, ' And your young men shall see visions. . . . Yea and on my bondservants and on my bondmaidens in those days will I pour forth of my Spirit ' (Acts ii. 17–18 ; Joel ii. 28–29). In the fulfilment ' there appeared unto them tongues parting asunder, like as of fire ; and it sat upon each of them. And they were all filled with the Holy Spirit ' (Acts ii. 3–4).

In the type ' the Lord . . . took of the spirit that was upon him, and put it upon the seventy elders : and it came to pass, that, when the spirit rested upon them, they prophesied ' (Num. xi. 25). The prophecy says, ' And your elders shall dream dreams : Yea and . . . I will pour forth of my Spirit ; and they shall prophesy ' (Acts ii. 17–18 ; Joel ii. 28–29). In the fulfilment there is an appearance ' like as of fire ; and it sat upon each one of them. And they were all filled with the Holy Spirit, and began to speak with other tongues, as the Spirit gave them utterance ' (Acts ii. 3–4).

Though there is no rigid distinction between the gifts of each of the types, each is clearly in view in the prophecy, and each has its fulfilment on the day of Pentecost, although the significance of the details is not explained.

Yet the gifts of the Spirit on the day of Pentecost have to do primarily not with the past but with the future. A true understanding of the types and prophecy of Joel is of value because it enables us to grasp the purpose of our Lord for the organisation of the church of the new covenant, which was to be a fulfilment of that foreshadowed in type and prophecy in the church of the old covenant. Our Lord had been revealed as the new Moses. He had inaugurated the new covenant by sacrifice. He had admitted men by baptism into the new kingdom of God. He had appointed the seventy, elders of the new sanhedrin, with an inner group of twelve. He had recognised certain men as servants of Himself and of the twelve. The organisation was complete before His passion. On the day of Pentecost it was clothed with power from on high, as He sent forth the promise of the Father. All are filled with the Holy Spirit, for the Spirit is to be poured upon all flesh. The tongues like as of fire sat upon each of them. They were immersed in the glory of the *Shekinah*, baptized with the Holy Ghost and with fire. All the Lord's people are prophets. The servants of our Lord and His apostles receive their special gift, just as Joshua, Moses' servant, the bondservant of the Lord, was made partaker of the majesty, or glory, of his master, for the fire was upon each. On His bondservants and on His bondmaidens He had poured out His Spirit. The seventy, too, receive their necessary endowment, for upon 'your elders' He has poured forth of His Spirit, and the Spirit rests upon them as upon the seventy elders in the wilderness, sitting upon each. Interpreted in the light of type and prophecy, the gift of the Spirit is threefold, for all the people, for the elders of the people, and for the servants of the Lord. There is nothing to suggest a special charisma for the twelve apostles. They are included in the seventy. Their prerogative is of dignity, not of grace. They are 'fellow elders' (I. Pet. v. 1).

The prophecy of Joel by referring us back to the outpourings of the Spirit in the Pentateuch suggests two distinct methods by which the Holy Ghost may be received under the new dispensation. In the case of the seventy elders the Spirit, though taken from Moses, was bestowed by God directly: ‘The Lord . . . took of the spirit that was upon him, and put it upon the seventy elders’ (Num. xi. 25). In the case of Joshua it was bestowed by Moses by the laying on of hands: ‘And Joshua the son of Nun was full of the spirit of wisdom; for Moses had laid his hands upon him’ (Deut. xxxiv. 9). Partaking of the glory of God after communion with Him, ‘the skin of his face sent forth beams’ (Exod. xxxiv. 30). Also, it would seem, like Jehovah Himself, ‘He had beams coming forth from his hand’ (Hab. iii. 4; cf. Deut. xxxiii. 2). At Pentecost the gift of the Holy Ghost is described as the outpouring both of God and of the new Moses, of the Father and Jesus (Acts ii. 17, 33). In the days of His flesh Jesus conferred blessings by the laying on of hands (Luke xiii. 13; Mark v. 23, vii. 32, viii. 23, x. 16; Matt. ix. 18, xix. 13, 15), and so presumably power went out of Him (Luke viii. 46; Mark v. 30). For the transmission of the gifts of Pentecost the laying on of hands is the only one of the two methods suggested by the types in the Pentateuch available for the church. On the day of Pentecost Peter was already fully cognisant of the method to be adopted, for when the people asked ‘What shall we do?’ his answer was unhesitating, ‘Repent ye, and be baptized every one of you . . . and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost’ (Acts ii. 37–38). That a means of bestowing it is available is taken for granted. The prophecy of Joel in the light of the Old Testament types suggests the method, the laying on of hands, which indeed is the action used in later practice. As Peter’s exhortation is concerned almost entirely with ‘the promise’ of the Holy Ghost, we cannot doubt that the three thousand, who were baptized as a result, received the gift of the Spirit, not by a fresh outpouring from on high which would have made the original outpouring on the hundred and twenty seem almost insignificant, but by the laying on of hands.

This conclusion is confirmed by the account of the conversion of the Samaritans: ‘And Philip went down to the city of Samaria, and proclaimed unto them the Christ. . . . And when they believed Philip preaching good tidings concerning the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ, they were baptized, both men and women. . . . And when the apostles which were at Jerusalem heard that Samaria had received the word of God, they sent unto them Peter and John: who, when they were come down, prayed for them, that they might receive the Holy Ghost: for as yet he was fallen upon none of them: only they had been baptized into the name of the Lord Jesus. Then laid they their hands on them, and they received the Holy Ghost’ (Acts viii. 5, 12, 14–17). The method by which the Holy Spirit was given in this case admits of no doubt. Still further emphasis is laid upon the mode by the incident of Simon Magus: ‘Now when Simon saw that through the laying on of the apostles’ hands the Holy Ghost was given, he offered them money, saying, Give me also this power, that on whomsoever I lay my hands, he may receive the Holy Ghost’ (Acts viii. 18–19). As Simon ‘saw’ that the Holy Ghost was given, the gift was presumably accompanied by speaking with tongues or prophesying. So on the day of Pentecost Peter spoke of the outpouring of the Spirit, ‘which ye see and hear.’ On the day of Pentecost the outpouring is called ‘the gift of the Holy Ghost,’ which agrees with the words used here, ‘the Holy Ghost was given.’ To Simon, Peter says: ‘Thou hast thought to obtain the gift of God with money’ (Acts viii. 20). ‘The gift of God’ here is not ‘the gift of the Holy Ghost,’ but the ‘power’ to give the Holy Ghost, presumably a higher gift of those bestowed at Pentecost. We notice that

Philip, one of the seven of Jerusalem, could baptize but could not lay his hands on the Samaritans. For this the apostles of Jerusalem sent two of their number, Peter and John. So Simon saw that through 'the laying on of the apostles' hands' the Holy Ghost was given. That there is a difference of 'power' between Philip and the apostles is very plain. Evidently it corresponds with a difference in order, the two orders of 'elders,' including apostles, and 'servants' being suggested, as we have seen, by the passage of Joel quoted by Peter on the day of Pentecost and the Old Testament types on which it is based.

The outpouring of the Spirit on Cornelius and his company is the only instance in which after the day of Pentecost the Holy Ghost is given, save by the laying on of hands. 'While Peter yet spake these words, the Holy Ghost fell on all them which heard the word. And they of the circumcision which believed were amazed, as many as came with Peter, because that on the Gentiles also was poured out the gift of the Holy Ghost. For they heard them speak with tongues, and magnify God. Then answered Peter, Can any man forbid the water, that these should not be baptized, which have received the Holy Ghost as well as we? And he commanded them to be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ' (Acts x. 44–48). Peter himself describes the event on his return to Jerusalem. 'And as I began to speak, the Holy Ghost fell on them, even as on us at the beginning. And I remembered the word of the Lord, how that he said, John indeed baptized with water; but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost. If then God gave unto them the like gift as he did also unto us, when we believed on the Lord Jesus Christ, who was I, that I could withstand God?' (Acts xi. 15–17). It is quite plain that 'the gift of the Holy Spirit' bestowed on Cornelius is identical with the gift bestowed on the brethren at Jerusalem on the day of Pentecost. As on that occasion 'they heard them speak with tongues,' but there is no suggestion of the portents, the ‘ sound as of the rushing of a mighty wind,’ the ‘ tongues parting asunder, like as of fire.’ It is a case of baptism with the Holy Ghost, as foretold by John, as received by the ordinary brethren at Pentecost, not an ordination as ‘ elders ’ or ‘ servants,’ to which offices they had received no call.

The most remarkable feature of the incident is that the recipients had not been baptized, but were baptized afterwards. It is plain that baptism is not absolutely essential for the gift of the Holy Ghost. Our Lord and His disciples baptized, and, as explained to Nicodemus, baptism is a birth from above, the act of naturalising a person as a citizen of the kingdom of heaven, just as Jewish baptism was regarded as a new birth, the enrolling of a man in the number of the people of God, the conferring of a new nationality. The gift of the Holy Ghost is properly the prerogative of the citizens of the kingdom of God. In everyday life, however, privileges which as a right belong only to a native of a country may on occasion be bestowed on a foreigner as an act of favour, and it is the same in the kingdom of heaven. If, however, the privileges are to be permanent and continued as a right, naturalisation must follow. It was necessary, therefore, that Cornelius and his friends should be baptized even though they had received the Holy Ghost, that they might be ‘ added ’ to the body of believers and enter the kingdom of God by birth from above. The need is not less but more urgent because God has declared His will. As Peter explained at the council of Jerusalem, ‘ God, which knoweth the heart, bare them witness, giving them the Holy Ghost, even as he did unto us ’ (Acts xv. 8). Consequently he commanded them to be baptized forthwith.

This insistence on baptism makes it clear that the birth from above is quite distinct from the gift of the Holy Ghost and cannot be regarded as included in it, confirming our conclusion that those on whom the Spirit came on the day of Pentecost were disciples in the sense that they had been admitted to the ranks of the people of God, having entered the kingdom of God by baptism at the hands of Jesus or His disciples, being thus born from above, born that is of water and the Spirit, having received already the preliminary gifts of grace.

Another point we may notice is that Peter did not himself baptize the converts, but commanded them to be baptized, shewing that though confirmation was the prerogative of the apostles, baptism was, as a rule, delegated to others.

CHAPTER III

THE ORDER OF DEACONS

THE prophecy of Joel in the light of the types in the Pentateuch promises not only a general outpouring of the Spirit on all flesh, on the sons and daughters, but an outpouring suited to the needs of the young men, bondservants and bondmaidens. At the first eucharist we noticed the presence of an attendant or servant, and saw in the fact the recognition by our Lord of a lower order of the rank of servants within the company of His disciples. Their prototype was Joshua the servant of Moses. At Pentecost, as we saw, in fulfilment of the prophecy of Joel and the types on which it was based, the young men or servants as well as the elders and ordinary brethren received the appropriate gift from the outpouring of the Spirit. For any later increase in their number the method to be adopted for the bestowal of the special gift of the Spirit, as in the case of Joshua, would be by the laying on of hands. That this was actually the case we see in the first recorded example of the laying on of hands for the ordination of the seven deacons, as they came to be called. 'Now in these days, when the number of the disciples was multiplying, there arose a murmuring of the Grecian Jews against the Hebrews, because their widows were neglected in the daily ministration. And the twelve called the multitude of the disciples unto them and said, It is not fit that we should forsake the word of God, and serve tables. Look ye out therefore, brethren, from among you seven men of good report, full of the Spirit and of wisdom, whom we may appoint over this business. But we will continue stedfastly in prayer, and in the ministry of the word. And the saying pleased the whole multitude: and they chose Stephen, a man full of faith and of the Holy Spirit, and Philip, and Prochorus, and Nicanor, and Timon, and Parmenas, and Nicolas a proselyte of Antioch: whom they set before the apostles: and when they had prayed, they laid their hands on them' (Acts vi. 1–6).

It is plain from the narrative that there was no creation of a new office. The new factor was the admission for the first time, to the existing order, of men commissioned by the church, by the laying on of hands for the transmission of the Pentecostal gift suited to the office, the first members of the order having been appointed by Christ Himself and endued with the Holy Spirit at Pentecost. 'The daily ministration,' we notice, was already an established institution, to 'serve tables' a recognised office. The words 'ministration,' 'serve,' which in the Greek suggest the diaconate, and have given to the seven the title of deacon, are applied primarily in the text to the work of their predecessors, who were regarded as somewhat inefficient. The original body presumably would be all Hebrew Christians, and so it is natural that a certain bias in favour of Hebrew widows should shew itself. Peter thinks of two possible ways of remedying the trouble, either that the apostles should take the ministration, at any rate to some extent, out of the hands of the officials already responsible, or that fresh officers should be appointed whose duties would lie particularly with the Grecian widows. The first solution is mentioned simply to be put on one side. 'It is not fit that we should forsake the word of God, and serve tables. . . . But we will continue stedfastly in prayer, and in the ministry of the word' (Acts vi. 2, 4). The ministry of the word and the ministry of tables were distinct duties, and it was contrary to order and the fitness of things to confuse them, the word ‘ fit ’ or ‘ pleasing ’ being employed almost in its later technical sense of the decree of a council, here doubtless of the twelve who had called the multitude together. The duties of elders and deacons must remain distinct, so that the second alternative alone is possible, that there should be an addition to the band of servants. The names of the seven appointed are all Greek : ‘ Stephen . . . and Philip, and Prochorus, and Nicanor, and Timon, and Parmenas, and Nicolas ’ (Acts vi. 5), so that their sympathies would naturally be with the Grecian widows whom they were appointed to serve.

Peter’s advice to the brethren is specially interesting as shewing the thoughts in his mind with regard to the ministry to which appointments are to be made, and the pattern he wishes to imitate : ‘ Look ye out therefore, brethren, from among you seven men of good report, full of the Spirit and of wisdom, whom we may appoint over this business ’ (Acts vi. 3). We remember God’s word to Moses. ‘ Take thee Joshua the son of Nun, a man in whom is the spirit ’ (Num. xxvii. 18), and the later description, ‘ And Joshua the son of Nun was full of the spirit of wisdom ’ (Deut. xxxiv. 9). Joshua was evidently Peter’s pattern deacon. ‘ Full of the Spirit and of wisdom ’ probably refers to natural endowments, that like Joshua they were men ‘ in whom is the spirit.’ ‘ Full of faith and of the Holy Spirit,’ used later of Stephen, refers perhaps to his qualities as a member of the church, and the spiritual endowment which in varying degree was common to all the brethren. To qualify for their new office the men must have not only a natural aptitude or spirit, but in a high measure the gifts of the Spirit bestowed on every member of the body. In men already possessing these preliminary endowments the special gift necessary for their new work would find a congenial sphere of action. Such men therefore ‘ they set before the apostles : and when they had prayed, they laid their hands on them ’ (vi. 6).

Other statements about the deacons are of interest: ‘And Stephen, full of grace and power, wrought great wonders and signs among the people. . . . And they were not able to withstand the wisdom and the Spirit by which he spake’ (Acts vi. 8, 10). ‘And the multitude gave heed with one accord unto the things that were spoken by Philip, when they heard, and saw the signs which he did. . . . And the Spirit said unto Philip. . . . And . . . the Spirit of the Lord caught away Philip’ (Acts viii. 6, 29, 39). The thought behind each of these descriptions is of Moses, and Joshua who had received the spirit of wisdom from him. We have already noticed the signs and wonders wrought by Moses. ‘There hath not arisen a prophet since in Israel like unto Moses . . . in all the signs and the wonders, which the Lord sent him to do’ (Deut. xxxiv. 10, 11). The promise to Joshua was, ‘As I was with Moses, so I will be with thee’ (Jos. i. 5). So Joshua said, ‘To-morrow the Lord will do wonders among you’ (iii. 5). ‘The Lord our God, he it is . . . that did those great signs in our sight’ (xxiv. 17). In word as in deed the same is true.

St. Luke’s description of the effectiveness of Stephen’s words cannot be independent of our Lord’s promises in the gospel. ‘I will give you a mouth and wisdom, which all your adversaries shall not be able to withstand or to gainsay’ (Luke xxi. 15); ‘For the Holy Spirit shall teach you in that very hour what ye ought to say’ (Luke xii. 12). These sayings in their turn were suggested by what we are told of Moses, ‘I will be with thy mouth, and teach thee what thou shalt speak’ (Exod. iv. 12); ‘Whoever gained knowledge of thy counsel, except thou gavest wisdom, and sentest thy Holy Spirit from on high? . . . Wisdom opened the mouth of the dumb’ (Wis. ix. 17, x. 21). What we are told of Moses is predicated likewise of Joshua, for Moses had put of his majesty, or spirit, upon him; indeed, ‘Joshua the son of Nun was full of the spirit of wisdom; for Moses had laid his hands upon him’

(Deut. xxxiv. 9). Joshua is the prototype of the deacons, as Moses is of Jesus. This is the thought behind the whole narrative of Acts. As Joshua, his minister, or deacon, carried on the work of Moses, so the deacons carry on the work of the new Moses, Jesus. They work signs and wonders just as did Jesus, Who renewed the works of Moses, 'Jesus of Nazareth,' as Peter said, being like Moses 'a man approved of God unto you by mighty works and wonders and signs, which God did by him in the midst of you' (Acts ii. 22).

The influence of the stories of Moses extends even further. The spirit of Moses, of which he bestowed upon Joshua, was a gift from the *Shekinah* which we are told shone from his countenance so that the skin of his face sent forth beams of light. The Holy Spirit of God, which Jesus bestowed upon the deacons, was a gift from the glory of heaven which shone from our Lord's face at the transfiguration, when He was revealed as the new Moses, and still shines from the exalted Jesus, Who has for ever entered into His glory (Luke xxiv. 26; Acts xxii. 6–11). As Peter said, 'Being therefore at the right hand of God exalted, and having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Ghost, he hath poured forth this' (Acts ii. 33). So we understand the vision of Stephen: 'He, being full of the Holy Ghost, looked up stedfastly into heaven, and saw the glory of God, and Jesus standing on the right hand of God' (Acts vii. 55). Thinking of the vision of the young man Joshua and the elders on mount Sinai, Joel had prophesied as Peter said, 'Your young men shall see visions, and your elders shall dream dreams' (Acts ii. 17; Joel ii. 28). So now Stephen 'the young man,' or minister, sees 'the heavens opened' and the vision of God, as later Peter, 'the elder' (I. Pet. v. 1), was to behold 'the heaven opened,' having fallen into a trance. The glory of God is seen even in the countenance of Stephen himself. It shone from Moses, from the new Moses, Jesus. The Jews claimed that the glory of the *Shekinah* rested upon Eliezer, and shone from his countenance in rays of light,[1] and that looking upon rabbis who, as our Lord said, 'sat in Moses' seat' (Matt. xxiii. 2), men had seen in them 'the faces of angels.'[2] This now is true of Stephen, the servant of the new Moses, as he proceeds to expound the law of the first Moses: 'And all that sat in the council, fastening their eyes on him, saw his face as it had been the face of an angel' (Acts vi. 15).

Joshua was Moses' minister. He was also the minister of the tabernacle, for we are told that when Moses turned again into the camp, 'his minister Joshua, the son of Nun, a young man, departed not out of the tent' (Exod. xxxiii. 11). The Hebrew word for 'minister,' as we have seen, is that used in the book of Esther of the chamberlains of Ahasuerus (i. 10, ii. 2, vi. 3), the rendering in the Septuagint being 'deacons,' so that we read of 'the seven deacons of the king.' The *amarkelin* of the temple seem to have had the duty of distributing the gifts and offerings, a task not unlike that of the seven in Acts. The tractate 'Shekalim' says, 'It is usual to appoint . . . not fewer than seven *amarkelin*.'[3] In the synagogues similar officials were called *Parnasin*, or almoners, and seem to have been identical with the synagogue chiefs, or rulers of the synagogue, who might be 'young men' (Luke xviii. 18; Matt. xix. 20). Epiphanius, speaking of the Jewish Christian churches of Palestine, tells us that 'these have elders and synagogue chiefs,'[4] not elders and deacons. In the provincial cities of Judæa, according to Josephus, there were seven judges,[5] identical it would seem with 'the seven leading men of the city' of the Talmud,[6] who had the management and disposal of the goods of the community. The choice of the seven to attend to the daily distribution to the poor Grecian widows was thus exactly in accordance with what was suggested by Jewish tradition for such a purpose in accordance with the law of Moses.

---

[1] *Pirke* of R. Eliezer, ii. 3–4.

[2] Jer. *Ber.* fol. 9a.

[3] v. 2.

[4] *Haer.* xxx. 18.

[5] *Wars*, II. xx. 5.

[6] *Megillah*, fol. 26a.

CHAPTER IV

THE ORDER OF ELDERS

At a somewhat later date we meet with another order of ministers in the church of Jerusalem: ‘ Now in these days there came down prophets from Jerusalem unto Antioch. And there stood up one of them named Agabus, and signified by the Spirit that there should be a great famine over all the world: which came to pass in the days of Claudius. And the disciples, every man according to his ability, determined to send relief unto the brethren that dwelt in Judæa: which also they did, sending it to the elders by the hand of Barnabas and Saul ’ (Acts xi. 27–30). We meet with Agabus again at Cæsarea on St. Paul's last journey to Jerusalem, and the account is similar: ‘ There came down from Judæa a certain prophet, named Agabus. And coming to us . . . he said, Thus saith the Holy Ghost ’ (Acts xxi. 10–11). Paul and Barnabas we meet with a little later at Antioch, and there they are definitely called ‘ prophets,’ and are part of a band which is probably to be identified with those who came down from Jerusalem with Agabus, at any rate in part. For the first time we meet with Christian prophets. What exactly is meant by the term ? What exactly was the position of Agabus, Paul, Barnabas and the rest ?

The gift of Pentecost was before all things a gift of prophecy. The repeated prophecy of Joel was then fulfilled and the types which suggested it, ‘ I will pour forth of my Spirit, and they shall prophesy ’ (Acts ii. 17–18; Joel ii. 28–29; Num. xi. 25–26, xii. 6, xxvii.

18–21). Elders, deacons, all the Lord's people, in a sense are prophets, for all in a measure prophesy or speak with tongues. As the emphasis is so strong upon the point that the whole organisation of the church is prophetic, it is inconceivable, as is so often supposed, that Agabus, Barnabas and Paul are called prophets because they are no part of the regular ministry of the church. Rather it is true to say they were called prophets because they held the highest office in that company of prophets, the church, and were elders.

We are told of the four daughters of Philip, 'which did prophesy' (Acts xxi. 9), but though in the next sentence he calls Agabus a prophet, Luke does not call these virgins prophetesses. Of their father Philip we read, 'The Spirit said unto Philip,' 'The Spirit of the Lord caught away Philip' (Acts viii. 29, 39). 'He preached the gospel' with the greatest success, so that 'the multitudes gave heed with one accord' (Acts viii. 5–6, 40), but though he is described as 'the evangelist' (xxi. 8), he is never called a prophet. Stephen likewise is described as 'full of the Spirit and of wisdom,' 'full of faith and of the Holy Spirit,' 'full of the Holy Ghost' (Acts vi. 3, 5, vii. 55); 'They were not able to withstand the wisdom and the Spirit by which he spake' (vi. 10). Yet he is never called a prophet. To St. Luke 'prophet' is apparently the technical name of an order in the church, not merely the description of a person who prophesies. We notice that all whom he calls 'prophets' are people from Jerusalem (xi. 27, xiii. 1, xv. 32, xxi. 10). The suggestion is that Agabus, Barnabas, Saul and the rest were prophets because they were elders of the church of Jerusalem. The seventy elders in the wilderness, we remember, when the Spirit rested upon them, not only prophesied but are definitely called prophets (Num. xi. 25–29), and the elders of the Christian church, as we have seen, are regarded as their successors in the new covenant. In Jewish tradition also, according to the

Old and New Testaments, Josephus and the Talmud, the high priest, the president of the sanhedrin except in the last, by virtue of his office is a prophet.

The prophets went down to Antioch and other cities apparently to impart some spiritual gift, as St. Paul says to the Romans (i. 11). We are reminded of the Jewish elders of the great sanhedrin going on tour to their villages and throughout the land, as Josephus and the Talmud depict them. We think too of the way in which Peter 'the elder' (I. Pet. v. 1) 'went throughout all parts' (Acts ix. 32). None of the prophets at Antioch belonged to the twelve, and we have no evidence that they belonged to the seventy, which indeed would have been impossible in the case of Saul; but they may well have been later additions to the original band, just as the seven were to the original band of deacons. This, at any rate, is what the evidence suggests. We recognise in them not merely prophets in the sense of men who prophesy, but members of an order, the highest in the church, elders of the new Christian sanhedrin, elders that is of the church of Jerusalem, the great church.

The relation of one of the prophets, Saul, to the church of Jerusalem is perhaps worthy of separate consideration. After his escape from Damascus we are told of him: 'And when he was come to Jerusalem, he assayed to join himself to the disciples: and they were all afraid of him, not believing that he was a disciple. But Barnabas took him, and brought him to the apostles, and declared unto them how he had seen the Lord in the way, and that he had spoken to him, and how at Damascus he had preached boldly in the name of Jesus. And he was with them going in and going out at Jerusalem, preaching boldly in the name of the Lord' (Acts ix. 26–29). St. Paul, we notice, was with the apostles going in and going out at Jerusalem. He took his share that is in the various undertakings of the apostles, and was regarded apparently as being of similar rank to the twelve. We remember our Lord's saying with reference to the true teacher and shepherd, 'By me if any man enter in, he shall be saved, and shall go in and go out, and shall find pasture' (John x. 9). We are reminded too of the prayer of Moses at the appointment of his successor Joshua: 'Let the Lord, the God of the spirits of all flesh, appoint a man over the congregation, which may go out before them, and which may come in before them, and which may lead them out, and which may bring them in; that the congregation of the Lord be not as sheep which have no shepherd' (Num. xxvii. 16–17). St. Paul is thus to be regarded as a true teacher of Christ, a leader and shepherd of the new people of God, holding an office in the new dispensation comparable with that of Joshua, the successor of Moses, who was filled with his spirit, in the old. He ranks as one of the elders of the church of the new covenant, filled with the Spirit of Jesus, the new Moses. He had been baptized by Ananias at Damascus, and likewise, it would seem, confirmed. He must also have received ordination before he could be accepted as a teacher on an equality with the apostles. There is no reason to suppose that his call could take the place of ordination any more than of baptism or of instruction, and so presumably he received not only instruction in the Christian faith and tradition from the apostles who received him at Jerusalem, but also ordination. To the Corinthians he says, 'I delivered unto you first of all that which also I received' (I. xv. 3). To the Galatians, speaking of this visit to Jerusalem, he writes: 'Then after three years I went up to Jerusalem to visit Cephas, and tarried with him fifteen days. But other of the apostles saw I none, save James the Lord's brother' (i. 18–19). With Barnabas, who though not yet an apostle seems already to have occupied a high position in the church of Jerusalem, we have the three ministers of highest rank who were necessary, according to Jewish and, indeed later, Christian practice, for the laying on of hands in ordination. So apparently, like Barnabas and others, he became in the technical sense a prophet and teacher, an elder of the church of Jerusalem, the great church, ‘ going in and going out ’ with the twelve apostles on terms almost of equality.

If Agabus, who prophesied of the famine, and the other prophets with him were really elders of the church of Jerusalem, sent down to Antioch by their brother elders, the significance of the concluding words of the narrative with its abrupt mention of the elders is explained. ‘ And the disciples, every man according to his ability, determined to send relief unto the brethren that dwelt in Judæa : which also they did, sending it to the elders by the hand of Barnabas and Saul ’ (Acts xi. 29–30). When once we grasp the idea that Agabus, Barnabas, Saul and the other prophets were elders of the great church of Jerusalem, travelling with the authority of their brethren, practically as their agents, the position is perfectly plain, and the abrupt mention of the elders causes no difficulty. To Luke it was evidently a commonplace that ‘ prophets ’ and ‘ elders ’ are alternative titles for the higher officers of the church, and it never occurred to him to explain that the terms are equivalent, for the benefit of Theophilus and his other readers.

Another important person is Ananias at Damascus. ‘ Now there was a certain disciple at Damascus, named Ananias, and the Lord said unto him in a vision, Ananias. And he said, Behold, I am here, Lord ’ (Acts ix. 10). We are reminded of the promise to Aaron and Miriam, ‘ If there be a prophet among you, I the Lord will make myself known unto him in a vision ’ (Num. xii. 6). This is one of the passages utilised for the prophecy of Joel, so important for the early history and organisation of the Christian church. What is said of Ananias seems like a fulfilment of the promise to Aaron and Miriam. It is ‘ the Lord ’ who makes Himself known, and 'in a vision,' the Greek being exactly that of the Septuagint. Ananias is clearly a prophet. A prophet, we have seen, in the Christian sense, is an elder of the great church. That Ananias was an elder is confirmed by what we are told later. The Lord said, 'He hath seen a man named Ananias coming in, and laying his hands on him, that he might receive his sight' (Acts ix. 12). When our Lord commissioned the twelve and seventy, we read: 'And he called the twelve together, and gave them power and authority over all devils, and to cure diseases. And he sent them forth to preach the kingdom of God, and to heal the sick' (Luke ix. 1–2). 'Now after these things the Lord appointed seventy others. . . . And he said unto them . . . Heal the sick . . . and say unto them, The kingdom of God is come nigh unto you' (Luke x. 1, 2, 9). The twelve and seventy, we have seen, were the original elders of the kingdom of God. Of their activities Mark gives us further information, 'And they cast out many devils, and anointed with oil many that were sick, and healed them' (vi. 13). We compare the exhortation of James: 'Is any among you sick? let him call for the elders of the church; and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord: and the prayer of faith shall save him that is sick, and the Lord shall raise him up' (v. 14–15). Again, it is the elders who are to raise the sick, elders of the church of the dispersion (i. 1), which exactly describes the Jewish Christians of Damascus.

Describing Saul's future, the Lord said: 'He is a chosen vessel unto me, to bear my name before the Gentiles and kings, and the children of Israel: for I will shew him how many things he must suffer for my name's sake' (Acts ix. 15–16). The words cannot be independent of an earlier saying of Jesus: 'They will deliver you up to councils, and in their synagogues they will scourge you; yea, and before governors, and kings, shall ye be brought for my sake, for a testimony to them, and to the Gentiles. . . . And ye shall be hated of all men for my name's sake' (Matt. x. 17–18, 22). In the first gospel these words are part of the charge to the twelve, though in Luke wrongfully inserted in the discourse on the siege of Jerusalem (xxi. 12–13, 17). As this reminiscence of our Lord's commission to the elders is a decisive argument to Ananias, it suggests that he was something more than an ordinary convert, a personal disciple of Jesus, even it would seem one of the seventy. We notice the difference when Jesus addressed Saul and Ananias. The former said, 'Who art thou, Lord?' the latter, 'Behold, I am here, Lord' (Acts ix. 5, 10). One, it appears, knew Jesus personally, the other did not.

The story continues: 'And Ananias departed, and entered into the house; and laying his hands on him said, Brother Saul, the Lord, even Jesus, who appeared unto thee in the way which thou camest, hath sent me, that thou mayest receive thy sight, and be filled with the Holy Ghost' (ix. 17). Another prerogative of an elder now emerges, not only the healing of the sick, but the bestowal of the Holy Ghost. The earlier narrative in Acts seems at first sight to suggest that both the receiving of sight and the receiving of the Spirit followed the one laying on of hands, and that with Saul as with Cornelius and his friends the gift of the Holy Ghost was bestowed before baptism. 'And straightway there fell from his eyes as it were scales, and he received his sight; and he arose and was baptized' (ix. 18). Paul's own account, however, in his speech on the stairs at Jerusalem shews that this was not the case, for he makes it plain that even after receiving his sight he had yet to make his final submission to the Lord. It is impossible to imagine that the Holy Ghost was given to one not yet obedient to the faith, who still needed not merely instruction but argument to bring him to baptism. 'And one Ananias, a devout man according to the law, well reported of by all the Jews that dwelt there, came unto me, and standing by me said unto me, Brother Saul, receive thy sight. And in that very hour I looked upon him. And he said, The God of our fathers hath appointed thee to know his will, and to see the Righteous One, and to hear a voice from his mouth. . . . And now why tarriest thou ? arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on his name ' (xxii. 12–16).

Luke apparently in the earlier narrative has conflated the two layings on of hands, just as in the speech before Agrippa he has conflated the words spoken to Paul at his conversion, by Ananias, and in the temple, ascribing all to the conversion (Acts xxvi. 15–18). We can only conclude that with St. Paul as with others the gift of the Holy Ghost was bestowed by the laying on of hands after baptism. Ananias, a prophet and elder of the church, presumably a personal disciple of Jesus, perhaps one of the seventy, puts his hands on him and restores his sight, exhorts him and receives his act of faith, baptizes him, and then by the laying on of hands bestows the gift of the Holy Ghost.

Our inquiry seems to have made it plain that in the church of the new covenant, the new kingdom of God, as illustrated by the church of Jerusalem, there were divers ranks or orders. Above all was the glorified and ascended Jesus, the new Moses. Under Him were the elders of the new people of God, the prophets, of whom the seventy commissioned by our Lord were the original nucleus, chief among them being the twelve apostles, representing the seventy elders of the old covenant. Below these we have a body of servants or deacons, of both the Hebrews and the Grecians, the ministers, or attendants, of the new Moses, corresponding to Joshua. Lastly, we have the rank and file of the Lord's people, all in a secondary sense prophets, the new Israel of God.

CHAPTER V

THE MINISTRY OUTSIDE JERUSALEM

A SIMILAR organisation we find existed elsewhere than in Jerusalem. Baptism is the channel of admission to membership of the new people of God, the means of naturalisation in the kingdom of heaven on earth, and cannot be dispensed with. This comes out very plainly in the incident of the disciples of John at Ephesus. When they denied all knowledge of the gift of the Holy Ghost, Paul asked them, 'Into what then were ye baptized ? And they said, Into John's baptism. And Paul said, John baptized with the baptism of repentance, saying unto the people, that they should believe on him which should come after him, that is, on Jesus. And when they heard this, they were baptized into the name of the Lord Jesus' (Acts xix. 3–5). Baptism, however, is not sufficient. All the Lord's people must be prophets and partake of the Spirit. The method of its bestowal is that used by Moses, the laying on of hands. 'And when Paul had laid his hands upon them, the Holy Ghost came on them; and they spake with tongues, and prophesied' (Acts xix. 6).

Perhaps the most important passage dealing with the ministry is that which describes the commission of Barnabas and Paul for work among the Gentiles. 'Now there were at Antioch, in the church that was there, prophets and teachers, Barnabas, and Symeon that was called Niger, and Lucius of Cyrene, and Manaen the foster-brother of Herod the tetrarch, and Saul. And as they ministered to the Lord, and fasted, the Holy

Ghost said, Separate me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I have called them. Then, when they had fasted and prayed and laid their hands on them, they sent them away' (Acts xiii. 1–3). The prophets and teachers are mentioned as part of the organisation of the church at Antioch, but it seems plain that originally all belonged to the church of Jerusalem. There was a constant flow of brethren from Jerusalem to Antioch. Some travelled as far as Antioch after the persecution which arose about Stephen, Barnabas had been sent by the church, and prophets had come down with Agabus. Barnabas and Saul certainly belonged to Jerusalem, and presumably Manaen, being the foster-brother of Herod, while Symeon called Niger and Lucius of Cyrene can hardly be unconnected with the men of Cyrene who fled from Jerusalem to Antioch. The position of the prophets and teachers in the organisation of the church was obviously similar to that of Agabus, who is also described as a prophet. For the first time we meet with Christian 'teachers,' though the title is used only as a further description of 'prophets.' Christian prophets, we have decided, were elders of the new people of God, and so presumably, like Jewish elders, teachers of the law, the new law of Christ (cf. Luke v. 17; Acts v. 34). The additional title seems intended to emphasise another side of the work of the same people, for not all teaching of elders was technically prophecy.

We are told that 'they ministered to the Lord.' The Greek word translated 'minister' is that so constantly used in the Septuagint to describe ministering in the temple, and is used particularly of the 'service' of the high priest, as of Simon the son of Onias (Ecclus. l. 14), and frequently of Aaron and his sons (Exod. xxviii. 31, 39, xxix. 30, etc.), but also of priests, Levites and others. In particular we think of Samuel, 'And the child Samuel ministered unto the Lord' (I. Kings Sam.) iii. 1). Later we read, 'And all Israel from

Dan even to Beersheba knew that Samuel was faithful as a prophet to the Lord' (iii. 20). We have the same combination of words 'minister to the Lord,' 'prophet' as in Acts.

The statement shews a twofold fulfilment of prophecy. Moses, who was, as God said, 'faithful in all mine house' (Num. xii. 7), had prophesied, 'The Lord thy God will raise up unto thee a prophet from the midst of thee, of thy brethren, like unto me' (Deut. xviii. 15). The man of God had prophesied to Eli, 'And I will raise me up a faithful priest' (I. Kings (Sam.) ii. 35). Both prophecies were fulfilled in Samuel, who was a prophet-high priest, like unto Moses.

The idea of the equivalence of the offices of prophet and high priest is common in Jewish tradition, as we have seen, in the Old and New Testaments, in Josephus and in the Talmud. Moses and Samuel were high priests because they were prophets, the high priest of the line of Aaron a prophet because he was high priest. The prophets and teachers at Antioch are thus conceived of as prophet-high priests, comparable with Moses and Samuel. The emphasis on the fact that they were also teachers suggests further that there is the thought of teachers such as the high priest Simon the Just, and Hillel the Elder who in the Talmud is greater than the high priest, both of whom had their place among those rabbinical teachers who according to 'Pirke Aboth' were links in the chain of the tradition of *Torah*, who according to Jewish tradition were said to radiate the *Shekinah*[1] like Moses and Aaron (Exod. xxxiv. 29; Ecclus. xlv. 7). The prophets and teachers are, as we have seen, elders of the great church; but they are not only presbyters but priests, ministering to the Lord, and their office is sacerdotal.

Behind the description of the prophets and teachers at Antioch there is also a passage from the prophet Joel, whence the prophecy of the outpouring of the Spirit with the foreshadowing of the organisation of the Christian church is derived. ‘Sanctify a fast, proclaim a solemn service: gather the people, sanctify the church, assemble the elders. . . . Let the priests that minister to the Lord weep’ (ii. 15–17). Luke tells us of the ‘fast,’ the ‘service’ at which they ‘ministered to the Lord,’ ‘the church’ which is ‘the people’ of God, the prophets and teachers who are both ‘elders’ and ‘priests.’ The passage, indeed, would appear to have been not only in the mind of Luke as he wrote his account, but in the minds of the prophets and teachers as they ministered to the Lord. It seems not improbable that a meditation on these words, which appear in the very chapter which contains the great prophecy of the outpouring of the Spirit at Pentecost, suggested the prophetic message which was the cause of the first missionary journey and the conversion of the Gentiles. The words ‘lest they should say among the Gentiles, Where is their God?’ (ii. 17) might easily suggest such a mission, while ‘assemble the elders’ might be translated ‘choose the elders’ and be regarded as suggesting not only the separation of the elders Barnabas and Saul for work among the Gentiles, but the choice of elders for them. At the conclusion of his account of the journey Luke says, ‘And when they had appointed for them elders in every church, and had prayed with fasting, they commended them to the Lord, on whom they had believed’ (Acts xiv. 23). The statement may perhaps be intended merely to describe obedience to the words of the prophet. ‘Sanctify a fast, proclaim a solemn service; gather the people, sanctify the church, choose the elders. . . . Let the priests that minister to the Lord weep and say, Spare thy people, O Lord’ (Joel ii. 15–17).

---

[1] Ecclus. l. 5–10; Jer. *Ber.*, fol. 9a; *Pirke* of R. Eliezer, ii. 3–4.

We notice that there were five prophets and teachers at Antioch ministering to the Lord, but only two were commissioned for the work among the Gentiles. Apparently the two were commissioned by the three. This, as we have seen, is exactly in accordance with Jewish rule. ‘The *Semika* is to be decided by three, and the laying on of the elders’ hands by three,’ says the *Tosefta* of the tractate ‘Sanhedrin.’ [1] The *Semika*, as its name implies, is ordination by the laying on of hands, and it is included in the same rule with the laying on of the hands of the elders of the congregation on the sin offering (Lev. iv. 15). In the tractate ‘Rosh hashanah’ we read, ‘Every council of three in Israel is like the council of Moses.’ [2] According to the first gospel our Lord made the rule his own, ‘Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them’ (Matt. xviii. 20). Again Jesus appears as the new Moses.

The commissioning of Barnabas and Paul was evidently regarded as of so solemn a character as to be comparable with ordination, though not actually an ordination, for there is no evidence that the commissioners were of a higher rank than the commissioned. It was a solemn separation and benediction of Barnabas and Saul for a new work (Acts xiv. 26), a mission to the Gentiles, undertaken through the intervention of the Holy Spirit. It was therefore only to be begun with the approval of the whole body of the church, focussed as it were in the assembled church of Antioch, and the three elders, who represented not only the whole body of the elders of the great church, but the lawgiver Jesus Himself, the new Moses. We read: ‘Then, when they had fasted and prayed and laid their hands on them, they sent them away’ (Acts xiii. 3). Commissioned thus by prophetic action, Luke describes them as ‘being sent forth by the Holy Ghost’ (xiii. 4). Henceforth Paul and Barnabas are called ‘apostles,’ the title being applied to them twice in the account of the journey—‘the apostles,’ ‘the apostles, Barnabas and Paul’ (xiv. 4, 14)—though never previously, both indeed being definitely distinguished from the apostles in the earlier narrative, for when Paul came to Jerusalem after his conversion we are told, ‘ Barnabas took him, and brought him to the apostles ’ (ix. 27).

---

[1] i. 1.

[2] ii. 9, fol. 25a.

They were apostles, however, not directly of Christ but of the Holy Ghost and the church. We may compare them with the brethren mentioned by St. Paul, whom he calls ‘ the apostles of the churches ’ (II. Cor. viii. 23) ; yet they are not to be regarded as sent in the name of the local church of Antioch, but in that of the whole church of Christ. They give their message first to the Jews, but in a special sense they are ‘ the apostles of the Gentiles ’—a title St. Paul proudly claims for himself (Rom. xi. 13)—and were recognised as such by St. Peter at Jerusalem (Gal. ii. 9). In later days Paul by virtue of the fact that he had seen the Lord (I. Cor. ix. 1), and had been called by Him (Acts xxii. 7, 10), claimed to be ‘ an apostle of Jesus Christ ’ (II. Cor. i. 1 ; Eph. i. 1 ; Col. i. 1 ; I. Tim. i. 1 ; II. Tim. i. 1), ‘ not a whit behind the very chiefest apostles ’ (II. Cor. xi. 5, xii. 11), ‘ an apostle not from men, neither through man, but through Jesus Christ, and God the Father ’ (Gal. i. 1). In the Pastoral Epistles, however, we have practically a repetition of the three titles of the first missionary journey : ‘ prophet,’ ‘ teacher,’ ‘ apostle.’ ‘ I was appointed a preacher, and an apostle . . . a teacher of the Gentiles ’ (I. Tim. ii. 7 ; II. Tim. i. 11).

At the conclusion of the journey, as already noticed, we are told, ‘ And when they had appointed for them elders in every church, and had prayed with fasting, they commended them to the Lord, on whom they had believed ’ (Acts xiv. 23). The statement is important as mentioning for the first time local elders distinct from elders of the great church, or church of Jerusalem, and plainly subordinate to them. Their position relative to Barnabas and Paul is comparable with that of the local Jewish elders to the elders of the great sanhedrin of Jerusalem. They are appointed by them, and subject to visitation by them, for later we are told Paul went with Silas through the cities where they had preached the word, 'confirming the churches' (xv. 36, 41).

We hear of local elders again at Ephesus, plainly of a subordinate type and subject to Paul. 'And from Miletus he sent to Ephesus, and called to him the elders of the church' (xx. 17). He gives them a charge, 'Take heed unto yourselves, and to all the flock, in the which the Holy Ghost hath made you bishops, to feed the church of God, which he purchased with his own blood' (xx. 28). For the first time we meet with the title 'bishops' applied to elders. In a quotation from Psalm cix. we remember Peter applied the word 'bishopric' to the office of Judas, 'His bishopric let another take' (i. 20). As an apostle Judas was an elder of the great church. Now St. Paul uses the word 'bishops' to describe the elders of the local church of Ephesus. Their office is prophetic in origin—'The Holy Ghost hath made you bishops'—so that presumably they were ordained by the laying on of hands, the customary method by which the gift of the prophetic Spirit is bestowed.

CHAPTER VI

THE COUNCIL OF JERUSALEM

THE organisation of the church comes out very prominently in the description of the council of Jerusalem on the question of circumcision and the observance of the law of Moses. ‘And when Paul and Barnabas had no small dissension and questioning with them, the brethren appointed that Paul and Barnabas, and certain other of them, should go up to Jerusalem unto the apostles and elders about this question’ (Acts xv. 2). The apostles and elders of the church of Jerusalem, the great church, are evidently the final court of appeal. The fact is emphasised all through the narrative. ‘And when they were come to Jerusalem, they were received of the church and the apostles and the elders’ (xv. 4). ‘And the apostles and the elders were gathered together to consider of this matter’ (xv. 6). ‘Then it seemed good to the apostles and the elders, with the whole church’ (xv. 22). ‘The apostles and the elder brethren unto the brethren which are of the Gentiles in Antioch and Syria and Cilicia, greeting’ (xv. 23). ‘They delivered them the decrees for to keep, which had been ordained of the apostles and elders that were at Jerusalem (xvi. 4). The difference between an apostle and an elder we have decided is largely one of dignity, between different grades in the same order, the apostles forming the inner circle of the council of elders, assessors of Jesus as the new Moses (Luke xxii. 30). James is president of the assembly and sums up the debate. ‘And after they had held their peace, James answered, saying, Brethren, hearken unto me. . . . My judgment is . . . ' (xv. 13–14, 19).

James was apparently head of the church in Jerusalem even as early as the martyrdom of James the brother of John, for when Peter was delivered from prison he said, 'Tell these things unto James, and to the brethren' (xii. 17). He occupies the same position when Paul returned to Jerusalem before his arrest. 'And the day following Paul went in with us unto James; and all the elders were present' (xxi. 18). Paul is witness to the same thing, for he says of Peter, 'For before that certain came from James, he did eat with the Gentiles' (Gal. ii. 12). The fact that James was president of the council and head of the church, occupying a higher position even than Peter, suggests that he must have been an apostle, and is to be identified with James the son of Alphæus (Luke vi. 15; Acts i. 13). The evidence that James was an apostle seems to be incontrovertible, apart from special pleading. 'Then he appeared to James; then to all the apostles' (I. Cor. xv. 7). 'Other of the apostles saw I none, save James the Lord's brother' (Gal. i. 19). 'Even as the rest of the apostles, and the brethren of the Lord, and Cephas' (I. Cor. ix. 5). Our Lord's brethren at first did not believe in Him (John vii. 5; cf. Mark iii. 21, 31), but the fact that 'He appeared to James' (I. Cor. xv. 7) is a proof that he was a believer before the passion. Jesus' method was not to compel belief, and He appeared only 'unto witnesses that were chosen before of God' (Acts x. 41). We read, indeed, not only of James, but of his 'brethren' (Matt. xxviii. 10; Acts i. 14) generally, as members of the band of believers after the resurrection, and so others also must have been converted besides any who became apostles, of whom according to St. Paul there were more than one (I. Cor. ix. 5).

Only two types of apostles seem to be mentioned in the New Testament, the twelve who were delegates of our Lord Himself, and those who were delegates of the great church or of local churches. There is no evidence that James was ever an apostle in the second sense, and his history seems to preclude it, while the passages which speak of him as an apostle place him on an equality with the twelve, and indeed make him their president. The traditional seems the most probable interpretation of the evidence, that James and Judas, the brethren of the Lord, are James the son of Alphæus, and Judas not Iscariot of the twelve, sons perhaps of Mary's brother and the other Mary (Luke xxiv. 10; Mark xv. 40, 47, xvi. 1), Joses and Simon (vi. 3), also becoming believers before the resurrection.

At any rate James presides over the apostles and elders at the council of Jerusalem, and to that extent is superior to both Peter and Paul. Paul and Barnabas, as we have seen, are elders of the great church, and though no longer resident, are in the wide sense elders of the church of Jerusalem where the great church is localised (cf. Acts xviii. 22). We notice that 'the apostles and elder brethren' call them 'our beloved Barnabas and Paul' (xv. 25), which suggests a membership still existing, or at any rate intimate fellowship.

We are introduced also to other elders. 'Then it seemed good to the apostles and the elders, with the whole church, to choose men out of their company, and send them to Antioch with Paul and Barnabas; namely, Judas called Barsabbas, and Silas, leading men among the brethren' (xv. 22). As Judas and Silas belong to the company of the apostles and elders, not being apostles they must be elders. Later we read, 'And Judas and Silas, being themselves also prophets, exhorted the brethren with many words' (xv. 32). Again we see the equivalence of prophets and elders. Judas and Silas are said to be 'leading men among the brethren.' 'He that doth lead' is our Lord's description of an apostle (Luke xxii. 26). Here the word is used of elders, who are associated with apostles and equal to them save in dignity. We remember that

Aaron was called ‘ the high priest among his brethren ’ (Lev. xxi. 10) and Simon ‘ leader and high priest ’ (I. Mac. xiv. 41). As before at Antioch when the prophets ‘ ministered to the Lord ’ there is a suggestion of the high priesthood of elders, of Judas and Silas who prophesy to the church at Antioch. Again we have a solemn dismissal, this time from Jerusalem, ‘ So they, when they were dismissed, came down to Antioch ’ (xv. 30). As a consequence they become apparently ‘ apostles,’ like Barnabas and Paul, apostles of the great church of Jerusalem, ‘ those that had sent them forth ’ (xv. 33). Joining with Silvanus to write to the Thessalonians, ‘ Paul, and Silvanus, and Timothy, unto the church of the Thessalonians ’ (I. Thes. i. 1), St. Paul includes him among the apostles, ‘ We might have been burdensome, as apostles of Christ ’ (I. Thes. ii. 6). On the second missionary journey Silas holds the place occupied by Barnabas on the first.

Paul and Barnabas are ‘ apostles,’ and likewise apparently Paul and Silas. ‘ Paul and Silas,’ or ‘ Paul and Silvanus,’ is a combination often repeated (Acts xvi. 19, 25, 29, xvii. 4, 10 ; II. Cor. i. 19 ; I. Thes. i. 1 ; II. Thes. i. 1), and their rank in the church is evidently the same. The apostleship of Paul and Silas was indeed in origin identical, each being sent forth in the name of the church. The combinations, ‘ Paul and Silvanus and Timothy ’ (I. Thes. i. 1 ; II. Thes. i. 1 ; II. Cor. i. 19), and ‘ Silas and Timothy ’ (Acts xvii. 14, 15, xviii. 5), are also common, but we note that Timothy is always last. ‘ Him would Paul have to go forth with him ’ (xvi. 3), says St. Luke, presumably as attendant instead of Mark, and later he speaks of ‘ two of them that ministered unto him, Timothy and Erastus ’ (xix. 22). Timothy, who thus ‘ acted as deacon ’ to Paul, is called by him ‘ a deacon of God ’ in I. Thessalonians (iii. 2), according to the best reading. His position in the groups of names thus corresponds to his rank in the church at the time. From the point of view of church order Paul and Barnabas, Judas and Silas appear to be on an equality. All, as apostles or delegates of the great church, are manifestly superior to local officers. Paul and Barnabas, we have already seen, 'appointed for them elders in every church' (Acts xiv. 23). Paul 'called to him the elders of the church' of Ephesus and gave them a charge (xx. 17–35). Paul, Barnabas, Judas and Silas alike are said to confirm 'the souls of the disciples,' 'the brethren,' or 'the churches' (xiv. 22, xv. 32, 41). Elders of the great church, we see, rank as a superior order in a local church, above the local elders, the rule of the Jewish church still persisting in the Christian.

It seems to be true indeed not only of elders but of deacons. Stephen the deacon, whose work lay entirely in Jerusalem, is found disputing in the synagogues, exactly like a disciple of the wise, the rabbinical equivalent to a deacon, but we never hear of him preaching the gospel. Philip, on the other hand, whose work lay for the most part outside Jerusalem, as a result of the persecution about Stephen, spends his time preaching the gospel, and although it is noted that he 'was one of the seven' at Cæsarea, he is called 'the evangelist' (xxi. 8), a title more suitable, it would seem, for an elder, whose business is 'the ministry of the word' (vi. 4), 'to feed the church of God' (xx. 28), than for a deacon, whose duty was to 'serve tables' (vi. 2). So, too, Erastus, who comes before us first with Timothy as an attendant on St. Paul, and as a deacon of the great church, we find later settled temporarily at Corinth and acting as 'the treasurer of the city' (Rom. xvi. 23; cf. II. Tim. iv. 20), presumably in the matter of the collection for the saints, and so as an elder, the office of treasurer of the fund for the poor saints at Jerusalem belonging to the elders of the church (Acts xi. 30), in accordance with precedent in the Jewish church, not to the deacons, who are merely almoners or distributors. Deacons of churches other than Jerusalem are not mentioned in Acts, but as we hear of elders and deacons of the church of Jerusalem, and elders of the church of Ephesus and other cities of Asia, the presumption is that there were local deacons also, as indeed we know to have been the case from other evidence.

Paul and Barnabas did not go up to Jerusalem alone. ‘The brethren appointed that Paul and Barnabas, and certain other of them, should go up to Jerusalem’ (xv. 2). The others presumably went as their attendants. Paul and Barnabas were ‘teachers’ (xiii. 1), and Jewish teachers, or rabbis, were commonly accompanied by their pupils, ‘the disciples of the wise,’ as attendants. So, as we have seen, Paul and Barnabas, or Silas, were accompanied by Mark, Timothy and Erastus. These, according to the Greek, ‘acted as deacons’ (Acts xix. 22), and so not improbably the others from Antioch belonged to this rank in the church. We are not told that they took any public part in the proceedings at Jerusalem, though they too were appointed by the church of Antioch to go up to Jerusalem about the question. Like the disciples of the wise among the Jews they were present presumably as assistants, not as actual members of the council.

The meeting of the council was public. Not only the apostles and elders but ‘all the multitude kept silence, and hearkened unto Barnabas and Paul’ (xv. 12). The decisions were regarded as those of the whole body. ‘It seemed good to the apostles and the elders, with the whole church’ (xv. 22). At meetings of the great sanhedrin of the Jews ‘the people’ occupied an important place.[1] The council of Jerusalem was in fact a meeting of the great sanhedrin of the new people of God under the presidency of James the Lord’s brother, who took the place of the high priest under the old covenant.

---

[1] *Sanh.*, T. viii. 2.

CHAPTER VII

THE MINISTRY IN THE PASTORAL EPISTLES

WHEN St. Paul gave his charge to 'the elders of the church' of Ephesus, he said, 'Take heed unto yourselves, and to all the flock, in the which the Holy Ghost hath made you bishops' (Acts xx. 17, 28). Bishops and elders are clearly identical. When he writes to the Philippian church he addresses not the elders and deacons, but 'the bishops and deacons' (i. 1). In the Pastoral Epistles we find many passages dealing with the ministry, but there is no distinction between bishops and elders. He writes to Titus, 'For this cause left I thee in Crete, that thou shouldest set in order the things that were wanting, and appoint elders in every city, as I gave thee charge; if any man is blameless . . . For the bishop must be blameless, as God's steward' (i. 5–7). In the first epistle to Timothy both titles appear, and though their identity is not so explicit, the description of the duties shews that they are not distinct. 'Faithful is the saying, If a man seeketh the office of a bishop, he desireth a good work. The bishop therefore must be without reproach . . . one that ruleth well his own house, having his children in subjection with all gravity; (but if a man knoweth not how to rule his own house, how shall he take care of the church of God?)' (iii. 1, 2, 4, 5). 'Rebuke not an elder, but exhort him as a father. . . . Let the elders that rule well be counted worthy of double honour, especially those who labour in the word and in teaching. . . . Against an elder receive not an accusation, except at the mouth of two or three witnesses. Them that sin reprove in the sight of all, that the rest also may be in fear' (v. 1, 17, 19, 20). The characteristic of both a good bishop and a good elder is that he rules well. As in the Jewish dispensation, the elder is a teacher. The procedure with regard to the accusation and punishment of an elder is based on Deuteronomy. 'At the mouth of two witnesses, or three witnesses, shall he that is to die be put to death. . . . And all the people shall hear, and fear' (xvii. 6, 13).

In the *Tosefta* of the tractate 'Sanhedrin' the rule about the two or three witnesses is several times quoted,[1] while in the *Mishnah* there is a precept with regard to a guilty elder so similar to that of St. Paul that the latter must be a later and milder version, the extreme penalty of death from Deuteronomy, which still appears in the Jewish recension, being modified to reproof. 'The defiant elder was not put to death by the court of his own city, nor by that in Jabne, but was brought up to the Great Court in Jerusalem, kept in prison till a festival, and put to death on a festival, for it is written, All the people shall hear and fear (Deut. xvii. 13).'[2] Though attributed to R. Akiba and mentioning Jabne, the reference to 'the Great Court in Jerusalem' shews that it must refer to pre-siege practice, which suits St. Paul's evident use of it.

The only reference to deacons in the Pastoral Epistles is in I. Timothy: 'Deacons in like manner must be grave. . . . And let these also first be proved; then let them serve as deacons, if they be blameless. . . . Let deacons be husbands of one wife, ruling their children and their own houses well. For they that have served well as deacons gain to themselves a good standing, and great boldness in the faith which is in Christ Jesus' (iii. 8, 10, 12–13). Nothing very definite is said about their duties, and the qualifications required are almost an echo of those said to be needful in a bishop. We notice, however, that though both bishops and deacons must rule their houses and their children well, only in the case of a bishop is it compared with taking care of the church of God.

---

[1] vi. 6, viii. 3.

[2] xi. 3.

That there is an order of ministers superior to the local elders and deacons is obvious in I. Timothy and Titus. Timothy is to apportion praise and blame to elders. 'Rebuke not an elder, but exhort him as a father. . . . Let the elders that rule well be counted worthy of double honour. . . . Against an elder receive not an accusation, except at the mouth of two or three witnesses. Them that sin reprove in the sight of all' (v. 1, 17, 19, 20). He is to give authoritative instruction with regard to what is to be taught. 'That thou mightest charge certain men not to teach a different doctrine, neither to give heed to fables and endless genealogies' (i. 3–4). He is to ordain local elders or deacons in the traditional way. 'Lay hands hastily on no man' (v. 22). He is to be in charge of the enrolment of widows, 'Let none be enrolled as a widow under threescore years old. . . . But younger widows refuse' (v. 9, 11). His position is to be one of supreme authority, 'These things command and teach' (iv. 11).

The position of Titus is practically identical. He is to govern the church and ordain. 'For this cause left I thee in Crete, that thou shouldest set in order the things that were wanting, and appoint elders in every city' (i. 5). He is to deal with false teachers. 'Reprove them sharply, that they may be sound in the faith' (i. 13). He is to speak authoritatively the things which befit sound doctrine to 'aged men,' to 'aged women' and to 'the younger men.' 'These things speak and exhort and reprove with all authority' (ii. 1–15). He is to rebuke heretics and excommunicate them. 'A man that is heretical after a first and second admonition refuse' (iii. 10).

Timothy's office is clearly regarded as permanent, the result of ordination, not merely a temporary delegacy from St. Paul. The apostle wrote, 'Neglect not the gift that is in thee, which was given thee by prophecy, with the laying on of the hands of the presbytery' (I. Tim. iv. 14), and again, 'I put thee in remembrance that thou stir up the gift of God, which is in thee through the laying on of my hands' (II. Tim. i. 6). The laying on of hands is a prophetic act, a conferring of the prophetic Spirit by those who are prophets already, accompanied in this case by prophetic utterance, presumably the charge or charges given by the ordaining prophets, as when Moses ordained Joshua, 'He laid his hands upon him, and gave him a charge' (Num. xxvii. 23). The charge to Timothy at his ordination was evidently in part identical with the charge contained in the first epistle. 'This charge I commit unto thee, my child Timothy, according to the prophecies which went before on thee, that by them thou mightest war the good warfare' (i. 18). The ordainers were prophets but also elders, for the gift was bestowed 'with the laying on of the hands of the presbytery.' The identity of prophets and elders we have noticed before. St. Paul was the chief ordainer, for he tells Timothy that the gift of God was in him 'through the laying on of my hands.' St. Paul was therefore the president of the presbytery, the chief of the elders or prophets. We remember that it was as a prophet that he ministered to God at Antioch on a not dissimilar occasion when he himself was separated for the work of the first missionary journey. Here too the reference must be to a presbytery of the elders of the great church, three at the least, as we have seen, for these only are called prophets. The reference is to Paul as part of the presbytery, not to Paul and the presbytery, two separate things, not therefore to Paul and a local presbytery, whose duties indeed, as set out in the Pastoral Epistles, Acts and elsewhere, never include ordination. The great sanhedrin of Jerusalem was a 'presbytery' (Luke xxii. 66; Acts xxii. 5), but for purposes of ordination a presbytery of three only was sufficient. Local elders did not ordain. It is the same in the church of the new covenant; only elders of the great church ordain.

Sometimes the Pastoral Epistles are regarded as post-Pauline, but the chief argument for a late date is the supposition that the picture of church organisation, and in particular the threefold order of the ministry, so plainly indicated, could not be early. Another argument to the same effect is based on linguistic evidence, the Greek, we are told, being very different from that of the apostle, but agreeing exactly with that of literary remains of the early part of the second century.[1] This argument, however, is really beside the mark, for such differences of language are indications of locality rather than of date. In a few decades a language does not change so very much in the same district, while local peculiarities may persist for centuries. Indeed, some of the characteristic features of the Greek of Asia Minor, which are found in certain books of the New Testament, are said to survive to-day. We should not, therefore, expect Aristarchus of Thessalonica, who not improbably was the amanuensis of the apostle for these epistles, to write Greek of the same idiom as Saul of Tarsus and Jerusalem.

Yet for our purpose the date matters little, for the epistles really tell us nothing that is new, the orders of ministers therein described, as we have seen, existing from the first. In the great church the hierarchy is: (1) Jesus, (2) elders including apostles, (3) deacons; in the local church: (1) elders of the great church, (2) local elders, (3) local deacons, the latter hierarchy corresponding to the former, each order at a grade lower down.

---

[1] Harrison, *The Problem of the Pastoral Epistles.*

CHAPTER VIII

OTHER EPISTLES OF ST. PAUL

Traces of the threefold order of the ministry appear elsewhere in the New Testament. In the first epistle to the Thessalonians we read: 'We beseech you, brethren, to know them that labour among you, and rule you in the Lord, and admonish you; and to esteem them exceeding highly in love for their work's sake' (v. 12–13). The passage exactly suits the local elders, and the reference must be to them. The word translated 'rule' is used four times in I. Timothy (iii. 4, 5, 12, v. 17), three times of a bishop, or elder, and once of a deacon 'ruling' his own house. In the case of the elder there is a comparison to his taking care of the church of God. The word means perhaps 'preside over' rather than 'rule,' and this describes the work of the local elders, but not that of the elders of the great church, who do not merely 'preside over' and 'take care of' the church, but rule 'with all authority' (Tit. ii. 15). For the Thessalonians the elders of the great church were, so far as we know, Paul and Silvanus only, but as these were writing the letter the reference could not be to them and must be to the local elders.

In I. Corinthians St. Paul gives a list of functions exercised by different people in the church. 'And God hath set some in the church, first apostles, secondly prophets, thirdly teachers, then miracles, then gifts of healings, helps, governments, divers kinds of tongues' (xii. 28). The first three items represent, as we have seen, not three separate orders in the church, but the three distinct functions of the first order. As commissioned by our Lord the apostles naturally come first. Endued with the Spirit at Pentecost, they became prophets and also teachers. Prophets, we have concluded, are the members of the highest order in the church who are not of the twelve, but who share their prophetic gift, either immediately as the seventy, or mediately by the laying on of hands. Naturally they were also teachers like the prophets at Antioch (Acts xiii. 1). Teachers would appear to be those of the highest rank in the ministry who are not conspicuous for prophetic gifts. Among the Jews we remember the prototypes of the highest Christian order were called teachers or doctors of the law, like Gamaliel (Acts v. 34) and others. Probably, however, though St. Paul has the highest grade of Christian minister at the back of his mind, he has the gifts rather than the men in the forefront. Barnabas and Paul, who were 'prophets and teachers,' became 'apostles' by reason of their commission on the first missionary journey. Others too are called apostles, as Andronicus, and Junias, of whom St. Paul speaks as 'of note among the apostles' (Rom. xvi. 7), Epaphroditus (Phil. ii. 25), and the brethren he mentions as 'the apostles of the churches' (II. Cor. viii. 23); and many have the gift of prophecy or of teaching. Unlike St. Luke, St. Paul does not hesitate to call all who have the gift of prophecy prophets, not simply those of the highest rank in the church. 'Let the prophets speak by two or three, and let the others discern. But if a revelation be made to another sitting by, let the first keep silence. For ye all can prophesy one by one, that all may learn, and all may be comforted; and the spirits of the prophets are subject to the prophets' (I. Cor. xiv. 29–32).

The remainder on St. Paul's list, 'then miracles, then gifts of healings, helps, governments, divers kinds of tongues,' cannot refer to orders in the ministry, so that the first part of it cannot properly be so limited.

In particular there is no reason to suppose that ‘ helps ’ and ‘ governments ’ have anything more to do with church order than ‘ miracles,’ ‘ gifts of healings,’ and ‘ divers kinds of tongues ’ among which they appear. The word translated ‘ helps ’ is one commonly used of succour or assistance in the Septuagint (*e.g.* Ecclus. xi. 12, li. 7 ; II. Mac. viii. 19), while that translated ‘ governments ’ is always used of guidance or counsel (Prov. i. 5, xi. 14, xxiv. 6). The passage really provides no fresh information about the orders in the Christian ministry.

Another passage in the same epistle is likewise worthy of consideration. ‘ Now I beseech you, brethren, (ye know the house of Stephanas, that it is the firstfruits of Achaia, and that they have set themselves to minister unto the saints), that ye also be in subjection unto such, and to everyone that helpeth in the work and laboureth ’ (xvi. 15–16). The ministry to the saints has nothing directly to do with the diaconate, but is the collection for the poor saints at Jerusalem about which St. Paul has been speaking. Those in charge of the collection were probably the local elders, as was certainly the case at Jerusalem (Acts xi. 30). That Stephanas and Fortunatus and Achaicus held such an office is highly probable, or in view of the custom in such matters they would hardly have been sent as messengers to St. Paul, as appears to have been the case. It is natural that ‘ the firstfruits of Achaia ’ should supply the first elders and ministers of the church. The epistle of St. Clement to these same Corinthians says definitely that this was the practice of the apostles, perhaps with this passage in view: ‘ So preaching everywhere in country and town, they appointed their firstfruits, when they had proved them by the Spirit, to be bishops and deacons unto them that should believe.’ [1] The submission required likewise suggests elders. St. Peter says, ‘ Ye younger, be subject unto the elders' (I. v. 5). St. Clement speaks of the Corinthians 'submitting yourselves to your rulers and rendering to the elders among you the honour which is their due.'[1] The same verb is used in each case. The passage gives us rather a glimpse of the elders or ministers of the church at work, than any fresh information about them.

---

[1] § 42.

In the epistle entitled 'to the Ephesians' we read, 'Ye are fellow-citizens with the saints, and of the household of God, being built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Christ Jesus himself being the chief corner stone . . . as it hath now been revealed unto his holy apostles and prophets in the Spirit' (ii. 19–20, iii. 5). The reference is to the highest order of the ministry which consists of apostles and prophets. Originally the apostles were the twelve and the prophets those of the same grade who were not apostles, but here, as the article is not repeated in either instance, St. Paul is not emphasising the difference. As it is the admission of the Gentiles to the church which has been revealed to the apostles in the 'Spirit,' he apparently has in mind the incident at Antioch, when, as the prophets were ministering to the Lord, the Holy Ghost bade the separation of Barnabas and Saul for work among the Gentiles (Acts xiii. 1–3). Whatever was the original destination of the epistle, those addressed must have received their Christianity as a result of that revelation and command. It was this which first made Paul 'an apostle of Christ Jesus through the will of God' (Eph. i. 1). Primarily, therefore, 'the apostles and prophets' are Paul and Barnabas with the others present at Antioch, but he generalises his statement so as to express a universal truth.

There is presumably the same background of thought to St. Paul's other statement about the ministry in the same epistle. 'And he gave some to be apostles; and some, prophets; and some, evangelists; and some, pastors and teachers; for the perfecting of the saints, unto the work of ministering, unto the building up of the body of Christ' (Eph. iv. 11–12). The first missionary journey explains each of the titles. Paul and Barnabas were 'prophets and teachers,' but being sent forth they became 'apostles.' Their work is repeatedly described as 'evangelizing' (Acts xiii. 32, xiv. 7, 15, 21), later as 'teaching and evangelizing' (xv. 35). Elsewhere Paul describes the work of himself and Barnabas as 'feeding a flock' (I. Cor. ix. 7).

---

[1] § 1.

Yet here too St. Paul is thinking primarily of the gifts of Christ, not of grades of ministers. Others besides himself and Barnabas and the twelve were apostles, prophecy was not limited to those in the restricted sense prophets, others also evangelized. All in a measure shared the same gifts. Pastoral rather than missionary work is in his mind: 'the perfecting of the saints,' 'the work of ministering,' 'the building up of the body of Christ.' The gifts shared by the local ministers and utilised in their pastoral work cannot be excluded, and particular reference to them is intended perhaps in 'pastors and teachers.' To the elders of Ephesus he said, 'Take heed unto yourselves, and to all the flock, in the which the Holy Ghost hath made you bishops, to feed the church of God' (Acts xx. 28). Similarly St. Peter exhorts the elders, 'Tend the flock of God which is among you, exercising the bishopric' (I. v. 2). To him Jesus is 'the Shepherd and Bishop of your souls' (I. ii. 25). The title of shepherd, or pastor, is closely associated with bishops or elders. A bishop likewise, says St. Paul, must be 'apt to teach' (I. Tim. iii. 2), while the elders 'who labour in the word and in teaching' are 'counted worthy of double honour' (v. 17). The passage therefore clearly cannot be regarded as a catalogue of ministers of the church, only as indicating various types of ministry, which manifest divers gifts of the Spirit.

We are now, perhaps, in a better position to consider the list of gifts which St. Paul gives in his epistle to the Romans. ‘And having gifts differing according to the grace that was given to us, whether prophecy, let us prophesy according to the proportion of our faith; or ministry, let us give ourselves to our ministry; or he that teacheth, to his teaching; or he that exhorteth, to his exhorting: he that giveth, let him do it with liberality; he that ruleth, with diligence; he that sheweth mercy, with cheerfulness’ (xii. 6–8).

The grammar suggests a differentiation of the first two gifts, ‘prophecy’ and ‘ministry.’ They correspond to the two orders of ministers in the great church, ‘prophets’ and ‘deacons.’

After the change in the construction we have first, ‘he that teacheth’ and ‘he that exhorteth,’ which describe the functions of a prophet. Barnabas and Saul were ‘prophets and teachers.’ Both on occasion ‘exhort’ (Acts xi. 23, xiv. 22, xx. 1, 2). We read also, ‘Judas and Silas, being themselves also prophets, exhorted the brethren with many words’ (xv. 32). Though Paul and Barnabas as prophets both teach and exhort, it is Barnabas who is introduced to us as the ‘son of exhortation’ (Acts iv. 36), but Paul who emphasises the fact that he is a ‘teacher (I. Tim. ii. 7; II. Tim. i. 11). It seems not unlikely that ‘he that teacheth’ and ‘he that exhorteth’ are mentioned in interpretation of ‘prophecy,’ because suggested by the special gifts of the ‘prophets,’ Paul and Barnabas. Yet St. Paul is speaking of gifts, not of persons, and not specifically of ‘prophets’ in the technical sense. The thoughts suggested by himself and Barnabas are made quite general—‘he that teacheth,’ ‘he that exhorteth.’ Similarly, ‘he that giveth,’ though mentioned as an interpretation of ‘ministry, is entirely general, and has no restricted reference to deacons, who doubtless suggested it, the word ‘giveth’ indeed implying the giving of one’s own, not the distribution of other people’s wealth.

The last two examples of men who possess special gifts, 'he that ruleth,' 'he that sheweth mercy,' seem to correspond to the two orders of ministers in the local church, the local elders and the local deacons. The verb 'rule' or 'preside over' is used by St. Paul of 'the elders who rule well' (I. Tim. v. 17), and for purposes of analogy to elders and deacons who rule their own houses well (I. Tim. iii. 4, 5, 12), appearing again in I. Thessalonians, likewise, it would seem, as a designation of local elders (v. 12). The words 'he that sheweth mercy' are an obvious allusion to a deacon, or almoner, the Greek verb used being that from which the word alms is derived. But again the officers of the local churches only suggest types of gifts which God has bestowed on the church. St. Paul is thinking of the gifts, not of the persons, of the gifts wherever found not merely in the elders and deacons, whose vocation it is to exercise them in a special degree.

St. Paul seems to have penned the whole passage with thoughts of the Christian ministry in the background, suggesting the gifts and kinds of people mentioned, but with their application completely generalised. In outline we recognise the prophets and deacons of the great church, and also the bishops or elders and deacons of the local church.

St. Paul begins his epistle to the Philippians with a salutation 'to all the saints in Christ Jesus which are at Philippi, with the bishops and deacons' (i. 1). The two orders of local ministers are plainly designated. St. Paul himself represents a higher authority, but in prison, whether at Ephesus or Rome, he cannot exercise control, or bestow any spiritual gifts in person. In the last chapter we read, 'I exhort Euodia, and I exhort Syntyche, to be of the same mind in the Lord. Yea, I beseech thee also, true yokefellow, help these women, for they laboured with me in the gospel, with Clement also, and the rest of my fellow-workers, whose names are in the book of life' (iv. 2–3). The 'true yokefellow' is probably Epaphroditus, St. Paul's 'fellow-worker and fellow-soldier' (ii. 25), who carries the letter. He is to help Euodia and Syntyche to be of the same mind, and in this task he is to join 'with Clement also, and the rest of my fellow-workers, whose names are in the book of life.' To describe people evidently still alive as having their names in the book of life is rather curious. We are reminded of our Lord's words to the seventy when they returned from their mission, 'Rejoice that your names are written in heaven' (Luke x. 20). Clement and the rest of Paul's fellow-workers at Philippi are put on a level with the seventy, the elders of the new people of God. The seventy elders of the old covenant are similarly described, for of Eldad and Medad we read, 'And the spirit rested upon them; and they were of them that were written . . . and they prophesied in the camp' (Num. xi. 26). Clement and his companions would seem to be elders of the great church, successors of the original seventy, who were visiting Philippi, and probably other cities of Macedonia and Greece to perform the higher ministrations of the church which for St. Paul himself were no longer possible.

The tradition is that Clement is to be identified with the Clement who wrote the epistle to the Corinthians on behalf of the church of Rome. The influence of the Roman church in Greece was probably early. Tradition has it that the founder of the church at Rome was Peter, and at any rate there is no other obvious competitor for the honour. It was presumably founded by some one man, for, writing to the Romans, St. Paul explains his rule of work. 'I have fully preached the gospel of Christ; yea, making it my aim so to preach the gospel, not where Christ was already named, that I might not build upon another man's foundation' (xv. 19–20; cf. II. Cor. x. 15–16). Speaking thus to the church of Rome, it could hardly be the one exception to the rule that each church could be regarded as having a definite founder, not in this case St. Paul. The epistle to the Romans like that to the Galatians is concerned with the relation of the new religion to Judaism. Such a discussion would be specially useful for those converted by the apostle of the circumcision (Gal. ii. 8). Petrine, and so probably Roman, influence was known at Corinth some time before the date of St. Paul's first epistle to the Corinthians, for in this we read that there was a party of Cephas, as well as of Paul and of Apollos at the time: 'I am of Cephas' (i. 12). Was it the same at Philippi? If so, Clement and the others whom Paul calls his fellow-workers were probably envoys of the church of Rome.

That there should be envoys to Philippi about the year 55 (or 60) during St. Paul's imprisonment, and that one of them should be Clement who afterwards wrote the epistle to the Corinthians, is by no means impossible. When Timothy acted in a similar capacity at Ephesus he was still young: 'Let no man despise thy youth' (I. Tim. iv. 12), 'Flee youthful lusts' (II. Tim. ii. 22). A delegate from Rome for work in Greece could not well be very old. Indeed, even a resident bishop might be young, as we learn later from the epistle of Ignatius to the Magnesians, 'It becometh you also not to presume upon the youth of your bishop' (3). If Clement was 35 in, say, the year 55, or soon afterwards, he would be about 76 in the year 96, which is the most probable date for the epistle of Clement, and this is by no means an impossible age for one holding the chief authority in the church of Rome. Of Clement of Rome Irenæus says, 'In the third place from the apostles the bishopric is allotted to Clement, who had both seen the blessed apostles, and conferred with them, and had the doctrine of the apostles yet sounding in his ears, and their tradition before his eyes.'[1] That Clement of the epistle to the Philippians and Clement of Rome are identical has been the common view in the church since the days of

---

[1] *Adv. Haer.* III. iii. 3.

Origen,[1] being adopted by Eusebius,[2] and until modern times has scarcely been controverted. The facts if they do not actually prove the truth of the tradition are at any rate entirely favourable to it. Whether the identification be correct or not, the office of the Clement who was working at Philippi is not changed, and it would seem that in the church of that city when Paul wrote his epistle the threefold ministry was in existence, elders of the great church, who were visitors, and bishops and deacons, who were resident.

---

[1] *In Joann.* i. 29.

[2] *Ecc. Hist.* III. iv. 9, III. xv.

CHAPTER IX

THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS

THE references to the ministry in the epistle to the Hebrews are few. The most likely explanation of the origin of the epistle, as it appears to the writer, is that it was written from Ephesus by Apollos, the learned Jew of Alexandria, who, being ‘ mighty in the scriptures,’ had ‘ powerfully confuted the Jews ’ of Corinth (Acts xviii. 24–28), to his converts there, a little later than I. Corinthians, in anticipation of the visit Paul wished him to make (I. Cor. xvi. 12), and promising once more the visit (xiii. 23) already promised by Paul, ‘ they of Italy ’ (xiii. 24), being Aquila and Priscilla, who are so described in Acts (xviii. 2), who had left Corinth with St. Paul and had settled in Ephesus (xviii. 18–19). We read, ‘ Remember your leaders, which spake unto you the word of God, whose faith imitate, considering the issue of their conversation. . . . Obey your leaders, and submit to them : for they watch in behalf of your souls, as they that shall give account ; that they may do this with joy, and not with grief. . . . Salute all your leaders, and all the saints ’ (xiii. 7, 17, 24).

The leaders must belong to the same class of minister in each instance. In Acts, speaking the word of God or of the Lord is used of the missionary work of Peter, John, Paul, Barnabas and Silas (viii. 25, xiii. 46, xvi. 32). St. Paul tells the Corinthians the gospel was preached among them ‘ by me and Silvanus and Timothy ’ (II. Cor. i. 19 ; cf. Acts xviii. 5), so that apparently the first ‘ leaders ’ of the Corinthian church were Paul and Silas, the apostles, prophets and teachers who evangelized Corinth. Our Lord described the twelve apostles as leaders (Luke xxii. 26), and Silas is called a 'leading man among the brethren' in the account of the council of Jerusalem (Acts xv. 22), bringing to our minds Aaron and Simon, 'the high priest among his brethren' (Lev. xxi. 10), 'their leader and high priest' (I. Mac. xiv. 35).

There is no need to suppose that the leaders of the first exhortation are already dead. The words seem to echo a passage of the book of Wisdom, 'Let us see if his words be true, and let us try what shall befall in his issue' (ii. 17), where the righteous man is certainly not yet dead, for the suggestion is that God will uphold and deliver him (ii. 18). The times, however, are critical and certain of the brethren are in prison and suffering persecution. 'Remember them that are in bonds, as bound with them; them that are evil entreated, as being yourselves also in the body' (Heb. xiii. 3). The leaders presumably are among them. It is apparently the occasion of which St. Paul speaks in his second letter to the Corinthians. 'For we would not have you ignorant, brethren, concerning our affliction which befell us in Asia, that we were weighed down exceedingly, beyond our power, insomuch that we despaired even of life' (i. 8). An imprisonment at Ephesus seems beyond dispute (cf. I. Cor. xv. 32). When Apollos writes, Paul and Silas are still in prison, but he says, 'our brother Timothy hath been set at liberty' (xiii. 23). Other 'leaders,' however, are at work at Corinth, for he writes, 'Obey your leaders, and submit to them' (xiii. 17).

Obedience asked for and obtained is the great feature in the settlement of the difficulties at Corinth (II. Cor. ii. 9, vii. 15, x. 5, 6), obedience to St. Paul and to those who were sent on his behalf. On the first occasion he says, 'I exhorted Titus, and I sent the brother with him' (xii. 18; cf. viii. 6). Titus and the brother are probably among the leaders Apollos asks them to obey. Later Titus went with the severe letter (ii. 13, vii. 6, 13), and probably not alone. After their submission Titus is sent again with two brethren, presumably 'leaders.' 'But thanks be to God, which putteth the same earnest care for you into the heart of Titus. For indeed he accepted our exhortation; but being himself very earnest, he went forth unto you of his own accord. And we have sent together with him the brother whose praise in the gospel is spread through all the churches; and not only so, but who was also appointed by the churches to travel with us in the matter of this grace, which is ministered by us to the glory of the Lord, and to shew our readiness. . . . And we have sent with them our brother, whom we have many times proved earnest in many things, but now much more earnest, by reason of the great confidence which he hath in you. Whether any inquire about Titus, he is my partner and my fellow-worker to you-ward; or our brethren, they are the apostles of the churches, they are the glory of Christ' (viii. 16–19, 22–23).

The collection for the poor saints at Jerusalem was for Christians the equivalent of the collection for the temple among the Jews. The latter was collected by elders of the great sanhedrin, or men their equal in rank, supernumerary elders as it were, assessors of the patriarch,[1] who were called 'apostles.' Those set over the Christian collection were apparently men of equivalent rank, elders of the great church, fellow-workers of St. Paul, the apostles of the churches. He calls them also 'the glory of Christ.' Our minds go back to the ordination of the seventy elders and of Joshua in the wilderness. 'And the Lord said unto Moses, Gather unto me seventy men of the elders of Israel . . . and I will take of the spirit which is upon thee, and will put it upon them' (Num. xi. 16–17). 'And the Lord spake unto Moses, saying, Take to thyself Joshua the son of Nun. . . . And thou shalt put of thy glory upon him' (xxvii. 18, 20). The glory is the manifestation of the Spirit, the Spirit is an emanation from the glory. The glory of Christ, who is the new Moses (Heb. iii. 2–6), is His fulness of Spirit (Luke ix. 32, 35, xxiv. 26; Acts ii. 3–4, 33), from which He pours forth His gifts upon all orders in His church, the Spirit of glory and of God, which resting upon them makes them partakers of the glory (I. Pet. iv. 14, v. 1). The apostles of the churches are in a special measure partakers of the glory of Christ, leading men among the brethren like Judas and Silas, 'leaders' to use the designation of the epistle to the Hebrews, belonging to the highest order of ministers in the church, prophets, elders of the great church.

---

[1] Epiphanius, *Haer.* xxx. 4. See p. 39.

A section of the Corinthian church claimed Apollos as their head, presumably the Jews he so mightily convinced, 'I am of Apollos' (I. Cor. i. 12). We see his reply, 'Obey your leaders, and submit to them' (Heb. xiii. 17). The trouble at Corinth was caused by some who denied the apostleship of Paul (II. Cor. xi. 5, xii. 11–12). As there were those who said, 'I am of Cephas' (I. Cor. i. 12), there were probably, or had been, at Corinth delegates of Peter as well as of Paul, and, particularly among the Jewish section of the church, there was a tendency to recognise only these as leaders, or to think these superior. The difficulty was probably only beginning when Apollos wrote, but he warns them against it and the danger of division. So with special emphasis on 'all' he concludes his epistle, 'Salute all your leaders, and all the saints' (xiii. 24).

The epistle gives us valuable information about the position of 'leaders,' the highest order in the church, to whom all must submit, whom all must obey. The same word 'leaders' is used by Clement of Rome,[1] Hermas,[2] Hegesippus,[3] Eusebius [4] and others, to describe the chief ministers of the church, or bishops, in particular the grandsons of Jude, Polycarp and Pothinus.

---

[1] §§ 1, 21.

[2] *Vis.* II. ii. 6; III. ix. 7.

[3] Eus. *Ecc. Hist.* III. xx. 6, xxxii. 6.

[4] Eus. III. xxxvi. 10, V. v. 8.

CHAPTER X

THE FIRST EPISTLE OF ST. PETER

In the first epistle of St. Peter, which there seems no reason to suppose other than genuine, there is an important passage dealing with local elders. ‘The elders therefore among you I exhort, who am a fellow elder, and a witness of the sufferings of Christ, who am also a partaker of the glory that shall be revealed: Tend the flock of God which is among you, exercising the bishopric, not of constraint, but willingly, according unto God; nor yet for filthy lucre, but of a ready mind; neither as lording it over the charge allotted to you, but making yourselves ensamples to the flock. And when the chief Shepherd shall be manifested, ye shall receive the crown of glory that fadeth not away. Likewise, ye younger, be subject unto the elders. Yea, all of you gird yourselves with humility, to serve one another’ (v. 1–5). According to what seems to be the better text they are identified with bishops, for their duties are described as ‘exercising the bishopric.’ Peter as an apostle is an elder of the great church, and as a fellow elder he exhorts the elders of the local church.

St. Paul spoke of Titus and his two companions ‘the apostles of the churches’ as ‘the glory of Christ’ (II. Cor. viii. 23). Here St. Peter makes a similar claim for himself, that he has a present share in the glory of Christ to be revealed. The context is important. He says he is ‘a witness of the sufferings of Christ . . . a partaker of the glory that shall be revealed.’ The words are an echo of our Lord's words in the gospel. 'Thus it is written, that the Christ should suffer. . . . Ye are witnesses of these things. And behold, I send forth the promise of my Father upon you' (Luke xxiv. 46, 48–49). 'Behoved it not the Christ to suffer these things, and to enter into his glory?' (xxiv. 26). Peter claims that the promise is fulfilled in himself, and that having received the gift of the Spirit he is already a partaker of the glory of Christ. We are carried back again to the great passages in the Pentateuch which tell us how the *Shekinah*, the glory of God, rested on Moses so that his face sending forth beams it was necessary to cover it with a veil, and that from this glory the Spirit of God was poured on the seventy elders (Exod. xxxiv. 29–35; Num. xi. 16–17, 24–30).

We notice that what for St. Peter is a present possession is put before his persecuted readers as a future reward of suffering. 'Inasmuch as ye are partakers of Christ's sufferings, rejoice; that at the revelation of his glory also ye may rejoice with exceeding joy. If ye are reproached for the name of Christ, blessed are ye; because the Spirit of glory and the Spirit of God resteth upon you' (iv. 13–14). The work of the Spirit is manifest, but for the present the glory is veiled. Participation in the unveiled glory is the reward also of faithful elders. 'And when the chief Shepherd shall be manifested, ye shall receive the crown of glory that fadeth not away.'

Behind this promise to the elders there seems to be the Jewish thought of the crown of *Torah*. In 'Pirke Aboth' we read, 'Rabbi Simeon said, There are three crowns: the crown of *Torah*, the crown of priesthood, and the crown of kingship; but the crown of a good name rises above them all' (iv. 17). There are precepts for disciples of the wise and so for elders. 'Lust not after the table of kings, for thy table is greater than their table, and thy crown is greater than their crown. . . . Greater is *Torah* than the priesthood and the kingdom' (vi. 5–6). Of the precepts of *Torah* 'Rabbi Zadok said, Make them not a crown wherewith to glorify thyself. . . . And in the same way Hillel said, And he who uses the crown to his own advantage fades away' (iv. 7). As by St. Peter the thoughts of the glory of the crown and fading away are associated.

The elders will receive 'the crown of glory that fadeth not away'; Peter is already 'a partaker of the glory that shall be revealed,' and so the crown of glory is already his. But what exactly are we to understand by 'the crown of glory that fadeth not away'? We must compare the words with the quotation from Isaiah which appears earlier in the epistle. 'All flesh is as grass, and all the glory thereof as the flower of grass. The grass withereth, and the flower falleth' (i. 24; Is. xl. 6–7). In the Hebrew it is 'The flower fadeth.' The point of the saying lies in the fact that the same Hebrew word means both flower and radiance or glory. This double meaning is behind our Lord's words. 'Consider the lilies. . . . Even Solomon in all his glory was not arrayed like one of these' (Luke xii. 27). The meaning 'flower' is not uncommon in the Old Testament. 'It bloomed blossoms' (Num. xvii. 8). 'He cometh forth like a flower' (Job xiv. 2). 'As a flower of the field' (Ps. ciii. 15). It is also the word used of the plate on the front of the high priest's mitre. 'And thou shalt make a plate of pure gold, and grave upon it, like the engravings of a signet, Holy to the Lord. And thou shalt put it on a lace of blue, and it shall be upon the mitre; upon the forefront of the mitre it shall be' (Exod. xxviii. 36–37; cf. xxxix. 30–31; Ecclus. xlv. 12). The plate is sometimes regarded as part of the crown, and sometimes identified with it. 'And they made the plate of the holy crown of pure gold, and wrote upon it a writing, like the engravings of a signet, Holy to the Lord' (Exod. xxxix. 30). 'And he set the mitre upon his head; and upon the mitre, in front, did he set the golden plate, the holy crown' (Lev. viii. 9). 'With a crown of gold upon the mitre, having graven on it, as on a signet, Holiness' (Ecclus. xlv. 12). We compare a passage of Isaiah where the translation flower is preferred, 'Woe to the crown of pride . . . and to the fading flower of his glorious beauty, which is on the head of the fat valley' (xxviii. 1). The word, indeed, is sometimes actually translated crown. 'From him that weareth purple and a crown' (Ecclus. xl. 4). The flower or glory in the Hebrew in the Greek is the petalon or crown of the high priest. The crown of glory of St. Peter is thus the petalon of the high priest's mitre. This will be the reward of faithful elders, a perfect priesthood.

The high priest's plate or radiance in later days symbolised the glory which in earlier days radiated from the face of Moses and Aaron in beams of light. The double meaning of the Hebrew word presumably suggested the details of the description of the glory of Simon son of Onias, which at one moment is compared with light and at another with flowers. The petalon has become the perfect beauty of the *Shekinah.* 'How glorious was he when the people gathered round him At his coming forth out of the sanctuary! As the morning star in the midst of a cloud, As the moon at the full: As the sun shining forth upon the temple of the Most High, And as the rainbow giving light in clouds of glory: As the flower of roses in the days of new fruits, As lilies at the waterspring, As the shoot of the frankincense tree in the time of summer: As fire and incense in the censer, As a vessel all of beaten gold Adorned with all manner of precious stones: As an olive tree budding forth fruits, And as a cypress growing high among the clouds' (Ecclus. l. 5–10). The perfect high priesthood of the elders according to St. Peter will be realised only at the *Parousia.* 'When the chief Shepherd shall be manifested, ye shall receive the crown of glory that fadeth not away.' For St. Peter himself it is a present possession, for already he is 'a partaker of the glory that shall be revealed.' As high priest he ministers to the Lord, and wears the sacerdotal plate or petalon. First of the apostles (Matt. x. 2), he is not only an elder (I. Pet. v. 1) but chief of the elders of the great church, presiding over the elders, presumably at Rome, which he calls 'Babylon' (v. 13).

Jesus is the 'chief Shepherd' according to St. Peter, and again we have the thought of the new Moses. 'Thou leddest thy people like a flock, by the hand of Moses and Aaron' (Ps. lxxvii. 20). 'Give ear, O Shepherd of Israel, thou that leadest Joseph like a flock' (Ps. lxxx. 1). Moses and the people alike were led by the glory of the *Shekinah*, that is, by the Spirit of God. 'And the Lord went before them by day in a pillar of cloud, to lead them the way; and by night in a pillar of fire, to give them light; that they might go by day and by night' (Exod. xiii. 21). So, too, was Jesus the new Moses led. 'And Jesus, full of the Holy Spirit . . . was led by the Spirit in the wilderness' (Luke iv. 1). The glory which led them likewise rested upon them. 'And the Lord came down in the cloud, and . . . the spirit rested upon them' (Num. xi. 25–26). St. Peter says, 'The Spirit of glory and the Spirit of God resteth upon you' (iv. 14). It is the Spirit of Jesus the new Moses, from the glory of the *Shekinah*, which rests upon them.

To St. Peter Jesus is 'the Shepherd and Bishop of your souls' (ii. 25). The elders are shepherds and bishops under 'the chief Shepherd.' He says, 'Tend the flock of God which is among you, exercising the bishopric' (v. 2). Similarly St. Paul had said to the elders of Ephesus, 'Take heed . . . to all the flock, in the which the Holy Ghost hath made you bishops, to feed the church of God' (Acts xx. 28). St. Peter says the elders are not to act 'as subduing the heritage' (v. 3); and St. Paul that they are 'to feed the church of God which he purchased.' The symbolism is from the Pentateuch where we read of ‘the people which thou hast purchased’ (Exod. xv. 16), ‘to be unto him a people of inheritance’ (Deut. iv. 20). Moses had commanded the heads of the people, ‘Ye shall subdue the land,’ which they were to ‘inherit’ (Num. xxxii. 29–30), but the elders of the churches are not to apply this to the ‘inheritance’ which is the people of God. The psalmist says, ‘Save thy people, and bless thine inheritance: feed them also’ (xxviii. 9), ‘He brought him to feed Jacob his people, and Israel his inheritance’ (lxxviii. 71). The language of both Peter and Paul is full of Old Testament thoughts, and particularly such as are associated with Moses. The elders appointed by Moses under the old covenant were evidently in the minds of both apostles as they set out the duties of Christian elders.

The remembrance of the last supper is also in Peter's mind. ‘Likewise, ye younger, be subject unto the elders. Yea, all of you gird yourselves with humility, to serve one another’ (v. 5). We read in the Gospels, ‘He that is the greater among you, let him become as the younger; and he that is the leader, as he that doth serve. . . . I am in the midst of you as he that serveth’ (Luke xxii. 26–27). ‘And he took a towel, and girded himself. . . . I have given you an example, that ye also should do as I have done to you’ (John xiii. 4, 15). We see the origin of the recommendation, ‘making yourselves ensamples to the flock.’ St. Peter's words confirm the interpretation given above, that our Lord's words at the last supper have to do with ranks in the Christian ministry. The ‘younger’ here too must include the ‘deacons’ in contrast with ‘the elders.’

CHAPTER XI

THE EPISTLES OF ST. JOHN

The second and third epistles of St. John give us important information about the organisation of the church. In each the writer calls himself 'the elder.' 'The elder unto the elect lady and her children' (II. 1); 'The elder unto Gaius the beloved' (III. 1). In the third epistle there is a glimpse of the working of the organisation, and the relations of different orders. 'I wrote somewhat unto the church: but Diotrephes, who loveth to have the preeminence among them, receiveth us not. Therefore, if I come, I will bring to remembrance his works which he doeth, prating against us with wicked words: and not content therewith, neither doth he himself receive the brethren, and them that would he forbiddeth, and casteth them out of the church' (III. 9–10).

Diotrephes was evidently a person who rightly occupied a position of some importance and authority, but clearly he magnified his office. The words, 'who loveth to have the preeminence among them,' remind us of our Lord's saying, 'Beware of the scribes, which . . . love . . . chief seats in the synagogues, and chief places at feasts' (Luke xx. 46; cf. xi. 43). At feasts, in the synagogues, and indeed everywhere, the scribes claimed the chief places. Precedence was also rigidly observed among themselves. The Talmud gives precise rules with regard to the occasions and places when it is fitting to 'honour a man,' or to 'assign honour to a teacher.'[1] Not only the great sanhedrin at Jerusalem, but each local sanhedrin had its president. Hillel in his earlier days seems to have been president of the elders of Bethyra, the Babylonian colony in Batanea.[1] Diotrephes would seem to have held a similar position among the local elders of the church in his city. He has pre-eminence rather than authority, and there is nothing which suggests that he is more than an elder who 'presides' (I. Tim. v. 17; cf. Rom. xii. 8; I. Thess. v. 12; I. Tim. iii. 4, 5). He is the head of the local church, forbidding those who would to receive the brethren commended by the elder and casting them out of the church. Yet he is clearly subordinate to him. 'If I come, I will bring to remembrance his works which he doeth.' The position of 'the elder' with respect to Diotrephes is exactly that of Timothy with respect to the elders of Ephesus, 'Them that sin reprove in the sight of all, that the rest also may be in fear' (I. Tim. v. 20), a precept, as we have seen, based upon the procedure of the great sanhedrin of Jerusalem in the case of a defiant local elder.[2] 'The elder' who writes is an elder of the great church, holding a position comparable with that of Timothy, Titus, Paul, Barnabas, Silas and others, and like them he exercises authority over the local elders, even over the president of the local presbytery. We have thus an illustration of the relative position of the two chief orders of ministers in the church.

---

[1] Bab. *Ber*. vii. 1, fol. 47a; Jer. *Ber*., T. v. 6, 7.

---

[1] Jer. *Pes.*, vi. 1, fol. 33a, Bab. pp. 126–127; *Sanh.*, T. vii. 11. See p. 25.

[2] Jer. *Sanh.*, M. xi. 3. See p. 117.

CHAPTER XII

THE APOCALYPSE OF ST. JOHN

Considerable information with regard to the organisation and ministry of the early church is to be found in the Apocalypse. It was written by someone bearing the name of John (i. 1, 4, 9, xxii. 8), who claims to be a prophet and to be writing a book of prophecy. The angel speaks to him of ‘ thy brethren the prophets ’ (xxii. 9), and he is evidently one of a company, for we read of ‘ the blood of saints and prophets ’ (xvi. 6), ‘ the blood of prophets and of saints ’ (xviii. 24), ‘ the spirits of the prophets ’ (xxii. 6). They are God’s servants. We hear of ‘ his servants the prophets ’ (x. 7), ‘ thy servants the prophets ’ (xi. 18), while the writer is ‘ his servant John ’ (i. 1). They are apparently prophets in the same sense as in St. Paul’s epistles (I. Cor. xii. 28 ; Eph. ii. 20, iii. 5, iv. 11) and in the *Didache* (x. 6, xi. 2, 5–12, xiii. 1–7, xv. 1–2), for we meet with the same combination, ‘ apostles and prophets,’ ‘ Ye saints, and ye apostles, and ye prophets ’ (xviii. 20). The ‘ two witnesses ’ are also ‘ two prophets ’ (xi. 3, 10), and are perhaps to be identified with the apostles Peter and Paul, appearing under the guise of Moses and Elijah (xi. 5–6). John was therefore a prophet comparable with the prophets of Acts (xiii. 1, xv. 32), Paul, Barnabas, Judas, Silas and others, and so, it would seem, belonged to the highest rank of the church’s ministers. He was presumably a Christian Jew from Palestine, who had accompanied the apostle John to Asia. He has a special interest in the churches of Asia, or he would not have addressed them, but, so far as we can see, not in one more than another. Quite apart from its impossibility during his exile in Patmos, there is nothing to suggest a localized sphere of activity, or that he was in charge of any particular church.

The Apocalypse opens with John's commission to write to ' the seven churches which are in Asia,' and he gives the letters sent. Each is addressed to the angel of the church concerned, ' To the angel of the church in Ephesus write,' and so on (ii. 1, 8, 12, 18, iii. 1, 7, 14). Many interpretations of these angels of the churches have been put forward, but in spite of the fact that the word 'angel' is used so frequently in the book to describe a supernatural being, it seems certain that the reference must be to men, and not to celestial guardians of the churches comparable with the princes of Persia and Greece spoken of by Daniel (x. 20). We notice that unlike the supernatural beings mentioned elsewhere in the Apocalypse (iii. 5) there is nothing to suggest that they are angels of God, only angels of the churches. John is told that ' The seven stars are the angels of the seven churches: and the seven candlesticks are seven churches' (i. 20). Though the stars and the candlesticks require explanation, it is assumed that John will understand the reference to the angels. The angels must belong to the same order of existence as the churches and be creatures of this world. The angels are the representatives of the churches not in heaven but on earth. It is impossible to write letters to celestial guardians. The contents of the letters also are quite incompatible with such a hypothesis. The angels must be the chief officers of each local church. The churches are addressed through their representatives, and, as a rule, it is not easy to distinguish what is intended for the whole church and what is simply personal. A distinction, however, seems sometimes to be intended.

We read, ' I have this against thee, that thou sufferest the woman Jezebel, which calleth herself a prophetess; and she teacheth and seduceth my servants to commit fornication, and to eat things sacrificed to idols' (ii. 20). It would be the duty of the chief minister of the church to suffer anyone to teach. That the reference is personal is even plainer if the alternative reading, 'thy wife,' be adopted. The angel of the church, the prophetess and the rest of the church, 'my servants,' seem to stand out quite distinctly. We may compare the authority of the angel of the church with that of the elder in the second and third epistles of St. John.

With the title 'angels of the churches' we may compare 'apostles of the churches' (II. Cor. viii. 23) used by St. Paul. An apostle is a messenger with the emphasis on the thought of the sender. An angel is a messenger with the emphasis on the message sent, or the work to be done. An apostle of a church is therefore a messenger from a church, an angel of a church, a messenger to a church. John the Baptist was the angel of God. 'This is he of whom it is written, Behold, I send my angel before thy face' (Luke vii. 27; cf. Mal. iii. 1). In John's case the emphasis is certainly on the message, 'He said, I am the voice of one crying in the wilderness' (John i. 23; cf. Luke iii. 4; Is. xl. 3). The two disciples the Baptist sent to Jesus are called 'the angels of John' (Luke vii. 24). Later we read, 'When the days were well-nigh come that he should be received up, he stedfastly set his face to go to Jerusalem, and sent angels before his face. . . . And after these things the Lord appointed seventy others, and sent them two and two before his face into every city and place, whither he himself was about to come' (Luke ix. 51–52, x. 1). The seventy are thus the Lord's angels, twelve of them, as we have seen, apostles. They are also, as we have decided, the nucleus of the elders of the church of the new covenant, the great church, which He founded. It is not therefore an inappropriate title for the successors of the seventy, the elders of the great church, sent before His face to bear His message and do His work in preparation for His second coming.

The apostle John, if not himself one of the first 'angels,' was at any rate in closest touch with them (Luke ix. 54). The seven angels of the seven churches of Asia would seem to have been the delegates of the apostle John in the churches of Asia which he controlled. They were apparently the first entirely localised elders of the great church with a permanent and definitely limited sphere of activity, not merely temporary delegates like Timothy and Titus of St. Paul, and not merely prophets who had happened to settle down in a particular locality such as we meet with in the *Didache*.[1] They were thus, it would seem, the first bishops who were diocesan in something like the modern sense. There is nothing to suggest that the apostle John was ever himself in any real sense bishop of Ephesus. He was rather a metropolitan with his headquarters there. Clement of Alexandria says of his work at Ephesus, 'He used to go off, when requested, to the neighbouring districts of the Gentiles also, to appoint bishops in some places, to organise whole churches in others, in others again to appoint to an order some one of those who were indicated by the Spirit.'[2]

An angel of the church, we have seen, held an office comparable with that of the elder John of the epistles. It is indeed not improbable that this John was actually the angel of the church of Ephesus, probably the first bishop of Ephesus in the later sense. In the *Apostolic Constitutions* we read, 'At Ephesus Timothy was ordained by Paul, John by me, John.'[3] This may very well represent a true tradition.

---

[1] See p. 148.

[2] *Q.D.S.* xlii. 1; Eus. *Ecc. Hist.* III. xxiii. 6.

[3] VII. xlvi. 7.

PART III

IN THE EARLY CHURCH

CHAPTER I

THE DIDACHE

OUTSIDE the New Testament the earliest document which gives us information about the Christian ministry would seem to be the *Didache*, or *Teaching of the Apostles*. The chief passages are as follows : ‘ But the prophets permit to give thanks as much as they wish. Whosoever therefore shall come and teach you all these things that have been said before, receive him ; but if he that teacheth be himself perverted and teach a different doctrine to the destruction thereof, hear him not ; but if to the increase of righteousness and knowledge of the Lord, receive him as the Lord. But concerning the apostles and prophets, so do ye according to the ordinance of the Gospel. Let every apostle, when he cometh to you, be received as the Lord ; but he shall not abide more than one day, or if there be need, another also ; but if he abide three days, he is a false prophet. And when he departeth let the apostle receive nothing save bread, until he findeth shelter ; but if he ask money, he is a false prophet. And any prophet speaking in the Spirit ye shall not try neither discern ; for every sin shall be forgiven, but this sin shall not be forgiven. Yet not everyone that speaketh in the Spirit is a prophet, but only if he have the ways of the Lord. From his ways therefore the false prophet and the prophet shall be recognised. And no prophet when he ordereth a table in the Spirit shall eat of it; otherwise he is a false prophet. And every prophet that teacheth the truth, if he doeth not what he teacheth, is a false prophet. And every prophet approved and found true, if he doeth anything as an outward mystery of the church, and yet teacheth not to do all that he himself doeth, shall not be judged before you; for he hath his judgment with God; for in like manner also did the old prophets. And whosoever shall say in the Spirit, Give me silver or anything else, ye shall not hear him; but if he tell you to give on behalf of others that are in want, let no man judge him. . . . But every true prophet wishing to settle among you is worthy of his food. In like manner a true teacher is also worthy, like the workman, of his food. Every firstfruit therefore of the produce of the winefat and of the threshing-floor, also of the oxen and of the sheep, thou shalt take and give as the firstfruit to the prophets; for they are your high priests. But if ye have not a prophet, give them to the poor. If thou makest bread, take the firstfruit and give according to the commandment. In like manner, when thou openest a jar of wine or of oil, take the firstfruit and give to the prophets; and of money and raiment and every possession take the firstfruit, as shall seem good to thee, and give according to the commandment. And on the Lord's own day gather yourselves together and break bread and give thanks, first confessing your transgressions, that your sacrifice may be pure. . . . Appoint for yourselves therefore bishops and deacons worthy of the Lord, men who are meek and not lovers of money, and true and approved; for unto you they also minister the ministry of the prophets and teachers. Therefore despise them not; for they are your honourable men with the prophets and teachers.'[1]

---

[1] x.–xv.

'The apostles and prophets' is a combination used by St. Paul (Eph. ii. 20, iii. 5; cf. I. Cor. xii. 28, 29; Eph. iv. 11), and, as here also, apparently, no difference of function is intended. Like St. Paul, the writer groups them together under one article. The difference seems to be a difference in the authority for the mission, both being members of the same ecclesiastical order. An apostle is a minister of the highest rank in the church, and is likewise a prophet, one who has been sent on a mission by the great church, as Barnabas and Saul, Judas and Silas, not merely the delegate of a local church. A prophet is one of the same grade of ministry, who is acting without any special commission of the church by private enterprise, as perhaps Agabus and Ananias.

'The ordinance of the Gospel,' with regard to the mission of the twelve and others, is applied to 'the apostles and prophets.' 'He that receiveth you receiveth me, and he that receiveth me receiveth him that sent me' (Matt. x. 40); 'Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that receiveth whomsoever I send receiveth me; and he that receiveth me receiveth him that sent me' (John xiii. 20). The precept, 'The workman is worthy of his food,' found in Matthew (x. 10) in the charge to the twelve, is applied to prophets and teachers. There seems to be also an echo of the injunction, 'Get you no gold, nor silver, nor brass in your purses,' also found in Matthew (x. 9) in the charge to the twelve.

Twice we are told that an apostle whose actions are unworthy, 'if he abide three days,' 'if he ask money,' is a false prophet; not merely a false apostle, we note, for that would imply simply that his mission lacked the authority of the church. 'False prophet' implies that he had received no commission from the church at all, that indeed he had not been ordained, at any rate not to the chief order in the church. The gospel test for false prophets is to be applied. 'Beware of false prophets. . . . By their fruits ye shall know them' (Matt. vii. 15–16). An earlier precept is, 'Neither be a lover of money' (iii. 5), with which we compare, 'Let your way be without love of money,' of the epistle to the Hebrews (xiii. 5), and St. Paul's requirement for a bishop, 'No lover of money' (I. Tim. iii. 3), the change from 'fruits' to 'ways' being thus explained.

A prophet is not to use his position to provide opportunities for his own advantage. We are reminded of a prophecy of Ezekiel: 'Thus saith the Lord God: O shepherds of Israel, do shepherds feed themselves? Do not the shepherds feed the sheep' (xxxiv. 2)? The shepherds are the rulers of God's people.

We have already concluded in examining the New Testament evidence that 'not every one that speaketh in the Spirit is a prophet,' as the writer says. Prophecy is a gift bestowed on every member of the church, upon sons and daughters, upon bondservants and bondmaidens as well as upon elders, who alone, however, are technically 'prophets.' The final proof that a man is not a false prophet is moral, that his way of life is true, as in the gospel, such a one being worthy of credence in his claim to be indeed a 'prophet.' No letters of commendation could provide a surer guarantee than the fact that 'he has the ways of the Lord.'

The teaching about false prophets is closely akin to what we find in the Talmud. 'A false prophet who is to be sentenced by the court is only he who prophesies what he has not heard and what he was not told at all. However, he who does not proclaim what he was told to do, or did not listen to another prophet, or he who acted against what he himself was instructed by Heaven, his death depends upon Heaven. As it reads: I will require it from him (Deut. xviii. 19). . . . But whence is one aware that he is a true prophet, that he should be punished? In case he gives him a sign. . . . With him who has long been recognized as a true prophet it is different. . . . Hence, because they were recognized prophets, one must listen to them in any event.'[1] In particular we compare the sayings of the *Didache* : 'If he doeth not what he teacheth, he is a false prophet,' 'He hath his judgment with God,' 'And any prophet speaking in the Spirit ye shall not try neither discern.' The contrast between the 'true prophet' and the 'false prophet' is common to both.

Almost insensibly the writer moves from a discussion of 'the apostles and prophets' to a consideration of 'the prophets and teachers.' In both cases the two designations appear with a single article. That no fresh type of minister is intended seems clear, for the first thing we are told about them is that, like the workman, they are worthy of their food, the saying of Jesus when commissioning the twelve apostles being applied to them, 'The workman is worthy of his food' (Matt. x. 10). The title 'teacher' suggests what we have concluded on other grounds, that the office is identical with that of Christian elder, or doctor of the new law. Barnabas and Saul, we remember, were 'prophets and teachers' until, sent forth by the church from Antioch, they became 'apostles.' A prophet's chief duty is to teach, 'And every prophet that teacheth the truth, if he doeth not what he teacheth, is a false prophet.' To the writer prophets and teachers are wellnigh synonymous, for he makes only a formal separation of the two, and then says the same thing about both. The double description seems to be due to a desire to emphasise different functions, perhaps also to suggest the existence of different degrees of prophetic power.

The comment, 'for they are your high priests,' merely puts into more explicit form what we are told of the prophets and teachers at Antioch, 'they ministered to the Lord,' the verb used in the Septuagint to describe the high priestly service being employed. A little later the writer himself uses it of the prophets and teachers: 'for unto you they also minister the ministry of the prophets and teachers.' The notion of the equivalence of prophets and high priests is common, as we have seen, in Jewish literature, in the Old and New Testaments, the Apocrypha, Josephus and the Talmud. We are therefore not surprised to find Old Testament rules with regard to the giving of firstfruits to the high priest and priests applied to the prophets and teachers as being high priests. It will be useful to set them out. 'And the Lord spake to Aaron. . . . Every firstfruit of oil, and every firstfruit of wine, their firstfruits of corn, whatsoever they may give unto the Lord, to thee have I given them. All the first ripe fruits that are in their land, whatsoever they bring unto the Lord, shall be thine. . . . But the firstlings of oxen, and the firstlings of sheep, and the firstlings of goats thou shalt not redeem. . . . And the flesh of them shall be thine' (Num. xviii. 8, 12–13, 17–18). 'And the firstfruits of thy corn, and of thy wine, and of thine oil, and the firstfruits of the fleeces of thy sheep shalt thou give him: because the Lord hath chosen him out of all thy tribes, to stand before the Lord thy God, to minister and to bless in his name' (Deut. xviii. 4–5). 'Ye shall bring from your habitation loaves, as a wave offering, two loaves; they shall be of two tenth portions of fine flour, they shall be baken with leaven, of the firstfruits unto the Lord. . . . They shall belong to the priest that offers them' (Lev. xxiii. 17, 20). 'The firstfruits of all things and the firstborn of all animals . . . of all your firstfruits, shall be for the priests: and ye shall give unto the priest your first ripe fruits, to put your blessings upon your houses' (Ezek. xliv. 30). The injunctions of the *Didache* are clearly an adaptation of those of the Old Testament, the prophets taking the place of the high priest and priests.

---

[1] Bab. *Sanh.* x. 6, pp. 257–60.

Precedent for giving firstfruits to a prophet is also to be found in the Old Testament. 'And there came a man over from Baalshalishah, and brought to the man of God of the first ripe fruits twenty barley loaves and cakes of figs ' (IV. (II.) Kings iv. 42). The precept that when there is no prophet the firstfruits should be given to the poor is not unnatural in view of a rule which in Leviticus follows close upon the law of the firstfruits. ' And when ye reap the harvest of your land, ye shall not wholly reap the remainder of the harvest of thy field when thou reapest, and thou shalt not gather that which falls of thy harvest, thou shalt leave them for the poor and for the stranger ' (xxiii. 22).

The order with regard to the eucharist: ' The prophets permit to give thanks as much as they wish,' is to be explained in the same way as the giving of firstfruits to the prophets, ' for they are your high priests.' The prophets and teachers are the primary ministers of the eucharist, bishops and deacons ministering simply as their substitutes. ' On the Lord's own day gather yourselves together and break bread and give thanks. . . . Appoint for yourselves therefore bishops and deacons worthy of the Lord . . . for unto you they also minister the ministry of the prophets and teachers.'

In another context in the *Didache* we read, ' My child, him that speaketh unto thee the word of God thou shalt remember night and day, and thou shalt honour him as the Lord; for whence the lordship is spoken, there is the Lord. And thou shalt seek out day by day the faces of the saints, that thou mayest rest upon their words ' (iv. 1–2). The passage is clearly based on the statements in the epistle to the Hebrews about the leaders. ' Remember your leaders, which spake unto you the word of God. . . . Obey your leaders . . . for they watch in behalf of your souls. . . . Salute all your leaders and all the saints ' (xiii. 7, 17, 24). We notice the references to speaking the word of God, remembering those who speak, and the saints. Remembering and watching naturally suggest the addition of ' night and day,' ' How unceasing is my remembrance of thee in my supplications, night and day longing to see thee, remembering thy tears ' (II. Tim. i. 3–4) ; ' They watched the gates also day and night ' (Acts ix. 24). All three ideas are mentioned together by Isaiah : ' I have set watchmen upon thy walls, O Jerusalem ; they shall never hold their peace day nor night : ye that are the Lord's remembrancers, take ye no rest, and give him no rest ' (lxii. 6–7). The word ' salute ' similarly suggests seeking the face. The ' leaders ' and ' saints ' of Hebrews are evidently identified by the compiler of the *Didache.* In Acts those who speak the word of God, or of the Lord, are apostles, prophets and teachers, as Peter, John, Saul, Barnabas and Silas (viii. 25, xiii. 46, xvi. 32). Evidently the reference is the same here, so that we have further evidence that the leaders are the members of the highest rank of ministers in the great church, apostles, prophets or teachers.

The words, ' Thou shalt honour him as the Lord,' must be compared with the later precept, ' Let every apostle, when he cometh to you, be received as the Lord,' which is based on the sayings of Jesus, ' He that receiveth you receiveth me ' (Matt. x. 40) ; ' He that receiveth whomsoever I send receiveth me ' (John xiii. 20), spoken to the apostles. The identity of the ' leaders ' receives therefore still further confirmation. The following words, ' for whence the lordship is spoken, there is the Lord ' cannot be independent of another saying of Jesus, ' Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them ' (Matt. xviii. 20), or of its rabbinical equivalent, ' Where two sit together and are occupied with the words of *Torah,* there is the *Shekinah* among them.' [1] The name is the name of the Lord Jesus, who, St. Paul says, is ' far above all . . . lordship, and every name that is named ' (Eph. i. 20).

The picture of the journeyings of the apostles and prophets, or prophets and teachers in the *Didache* is in exact agreement with what we are told of Jewish elders in Josephus and the Talmud, and of apostles, prophets, and teachers in the New Testament. Josephus says: ‘The rulers also and the counsellors divided themselves into the villages, and collected the tributes.’[1] The Talmud says: ‘It came to pass when the elders from Jerusalem went down to their towns that . . . they appointed a fast.’[2] ‘R. Jose went to Cephar, intending there to set *Parnasin* over them, but they received him not.’[3] Similarly, St. Luke says: ‘And it came to pass, as Peter went throughout all parts, he came down also to the saints which dwelt at Lydda’ (Acts ix. 32); also of St. Paul, ‘And he went through Syria and Cilicia, confirming the churches’ (xv. 41). It is in exact accordance with our Lord’s charge to the seventy and the twelve. In obedience to this in the earliest days of the church, the apostles and prophets, the elders of the great church spent their time in tours of this kind, as the New Testament makes abundantly plain. The condition of things described in the *Didache* is thus essentially primitive, and exactly what we should expect in an account of church life in the latter part of the first century.

---

[1] *Pirke Aboth,* iii. 3.

We notice the possibility of the prophet and teacher, not of the apostle, whose commission would prevent it, settling down, at any rate for a time, in a local church, and becoming a superior local officer. ‘Every true prophet wishing to settle among you is worthy of his food. In like manner a true teacher is also worthy, like the workman, of his food.’ Then in particular it is that the prophets are to receive firstfruits, ‘for they are your high priests,’ ‘But if ye have not a prophet, give them to the poor.’

An interesting story of such a Christian teacher settled in a particular locality is found in the Talmud in the *Gemara* of the tractate ‘Shabbath’: ‘Imma Shalom was the wife of R. Eliezer and sister of Rabban Gamaliel. There lived near her a (Christian) philosopher who had the reputation of never taking a bribe. They sought to make a mock of him. She sent him a lamp of gold. They came before him. She said to him, I desire that they give me a share in the family property. He said to them, From the day when ye were exiled from your land, the law of Moses has been taken away, and the law of the Gospel has been given, and in it is written, A son and a daughter shall inherit alike. The next day he (R. Gamaliel), in his turn, sent to him a Lybian ass. He (the philosopher) said to them, I have looked further to the end of the book, and in it is written, I am not come to take away from the law of Moses and I am not come to add to the law of Moses, and it is written, Where there is a son, a daughter does not inherit. She said to him, Let your light shine as a lamp. R. Gamaliel said to her, The ass has come and trodden out the lamp.' [1]

---

[1] *Wars*, II. xvii. 1.

[2] *Taanith*, iii. 6.

[3] Jer. *Peah*, fol. 21a.

We may note that Gamaliel's reply is quoted as a proverb at the end of a similar story in *Midrash Sifre* on Numbers. 'It once happened that one (who wished to be made high priest) sent (to the Gentile procurator, as a bribe), by his son, two silver measures, the strikes of which were also of silver. Then came another (with the same ambition) who sent, through his son, an even greater gift of three golden measures, their strikes being also of gold. This gave rise among the people to the proverb: The ass has upset the lamp.' [2] It is clear that the proverb could not in fact have arisen from this incident, for there is no mention of either lamp or ass. The comment is an editorial addition, and is evidence of the previous existence of the proverb. Its source in the story of the Christian philosopher is much more likely. It seems less probable that this is an invention on the basis of the proverb.

---

[1] *Shab.* fol. 116a and b. See Klausner, *Jesus of Nazareth*, p. 44.

[2] On Num. xxv. 12.

The date of the story is clearly after the fall of Jerusalem, but, as we gather from the people mentioned, not many decades. The Christian philosopher is evidently a teacher and judge, exactly comparable with Eliezer and Gamaliel among the Jews. Though a Christian he acts as an elder, and gives decisions like a Jewish rabbi. The law he administers, however, is not the law of Moses but the law of the Gospel. Yet it is plain that the philosopher does not simply quote the Gospel. The maxim, 'Where there is a son, a daughter does not inherit,' is presumably a deduction from the decision in the case of the daughters of Zelophehad, 'If a man die, and have no son, then ye shall cause his inheritance to pass unto his daughter' (Num. xxvii. 8). The second quotation of the philosopher has a likeness to a saying of the sermon on the mount, but with a big difference. 'I came not to destroy, but to fulfil' (Matt. v. 17). The saying of Imma Shalom appears to be based on another passage of the sermon: 'Neither do men light a lamp, and put it under the bushel, but on the stand; and it shineth unto all that are in the house. Even so let your light shine before men' (v. 15). R. Eliezer is known to have been influenced by Christian teaching, and so it is not altogether strange that his sister should have some slight knowledge of it.

What was the basis of the Christian philosopher's decisions? We notice that the reference to 'the law of the Gospel' is exactly what we find in the *Didache*, 'So do ye according to the ordinance of the Gospel' (xi. 2). We note also, 'As the Lord commanded in His Gospel' (viii. 2); 'As ye have it in the Gospel' (xv. 3); 'As ye have it in the Gospel of our Lord' (xv. 4). The rule, 'A son and a daughter shall inherit alike,' however, corresponds to nothing in the Gospel. Yet something not unlike it is to be found in the *Didache*. 'And thou shalt share all things with thy brother . . . for if ye are sharers in that which is imperishable, how much more in the things that are perishable. Thou shalt not take away thine hand from thy son or from thy daughter' (iv. 8–9). Similarly the rule, 'I am not come to take away from the law of Moses and I am not come to add to the law of Moses,' though verbally similar to the saying in the sermon on the mount, and probably not independent of it, really contradicts it, but it is in agreement with a precept of the *Didache*, 'Thou shalt not forsake the commandments of the Lord; but shalt keep what thou hast received, neither adding nor taking away' (iv. 13).

The evidence points to the conclusion that the philosopher was in possession of a manual similar to the *Didache* containing 'the law of the Gospel,' or 'the ordinance of the Gospel,' and that he was using it as the basis of his decisions. Though called a philosopher, he was evidently a Christian doctor of the law, an elder of the new people of God. His position corresponds exactly to that of 'the apostles and prophets,' or 'the prophets and teachers' mentioned in the *Didache*, in particular to that of one who had settled in a particular district. He was apparently using an early edition of the work, which would seem to have been intended as a handbook for the work and teaching of such ministers of the church.

The apostles, prophets and teachers, however, whether touring or settled, though they are the chief, are certainly not normally the only ministers of the church according to the *Didache*. After giving instructions with regard to the eucharist, it continues, 'Appoint for yourselves therefore bishops and deacons worthy of the Lord . . . for unto you they also minister the ministry of the prophets and teachers. Therefore despise them not; for they are your honourable men with the prophets and teachers.' The local officers, and indeed the prophets and teachers, exist largely for the celebration of the eucharist. The exact expression 'bishops and deacons' appears earlier only in the salutation of the epistle to the Philippians, 'to all the saints in Christ Jesus which are at Philippi, with the bishops and deacons ' (i. 1). Qualifications for both bishops and deacons, however, are given together in I. Timothy, ' The bishop therefore must be without reproach. . . . Deacons in like manner must be grave ' (iii. 2, 8).

The qualifications of the bishops and deacons are identical with qualifications required of ministers in the Pastoral Epistles, ' men who are meek, and not lovers of money, and true and approved,'—' in meekness correcting them that oppose themselves ' (II. Tim. ii. 25), ' no lover of money ' (I. Tim. iii. 3), ' handling aright the word of truth ' (II. Tim. ii. 15), ' Give diligence to present thyself approved unto God ' (II. Tim. ii. 15). The injunction, ' Therefore despise them not,' may be compared with words used of both Timothy and Titus, though the Greek is different : ' Let no man despise thy youth ' (I. Tim. iv. 12), ' Let no man despise thee ' (Titus ii. 15). The statement, ' for they are your honourable men,' carries on a long tradition with regard to elders and other ministers, traceable to the seventy elders and Joshua, upon whom the ' spirit ' or ' honour ' of Moses was bestowed (Num. xi. 17, xxvii. 20). Of the local elders Josephus says, ' Let those that are chosen to judge in the cities be held in the highest honour.' [1] St. Luke tells us of ' Gamaliel, a doctor of the law, had in honour of all the people ' (Acts v. 34). St. Paul says to Timothy, ' Let the elders that rule well be counted worthy of double honour ' (I. v. 17).

It is plain that whereas ' the apostles and prophets,' or ' the prophets and teachers,' are ministers of the great church, coming and going from one local church to another, the ' bishops and deacons ' are ministers of the local church only : ' Appoint for yourselves therefore bishops and deacons,' ' for unto you they also minister the ministry,' ' they are your honourable men.' Like that of the prophets and teachers, their office is sacerdotal, ‘they also minister the ministry of the prophets and teachers.’ We are carried back to Antioch, where the ‘prophets and teachers’ ‘ministered to the Lord’ (Acts xiii. 2), acting as high priests, as the writer of the *Didache* himself declares, describing the service of the prophets and teachers of his own time in the same language, and saying, ‘they are your high priests.’

---

[1] *Ant.* IV. viii. 14.

The *Didache* thus bears the clearest witness to the existence of the threefold ministry. ‘Appoint for yourselves therefore bishops and deacons . . . for they are your honourable men with the prophets and teachers.’

The apostles, prophets and teachers, officers of the great church, are ministers of the highest rank—‘The prophets permit to give thanks as much as they wish,’ ‘Let every apostle, when he cometh to you, be received as the Lord.’

The bishops and deacons, officers of the local church, are ministers of subordinate rank—‘Despise them not.’

On the question of the ministry the *Didache* is thus in exact agreement with what we learned about the organisation of the church from the gospels, the Acts of the Apostles, the Pastoral Epistles, and indeed the rest of the New Testament.

Unfortunately it says nothing of the ordination, as distinct from the appointment, of ministers. In the *Ascension of Isaiah*, however, as we have seen, in a part which is based on a Jewish Christian document of about the same date, the local prophets are commissioned by a great prophet like Isaiah by the laying on of hands.[1] This is not improbably a reflexion of current Christian practice. If so, the presumption is that the same usage prevailed in the region represented by the *Didache*. This indeed is only what we should expect in view of the New Testament evidence.

---

[1] vi. 3, 5. See p. 36.

CHAPTER II

THE EPISTLE OF CLEMENT

Clement of Rome, writing about the year 96, gives very important information about the Christian ministry and the organisation of the Christian church. His exposition is based on analogy with the Jewish church. 'Now the offerings and ministrations He commanded to be performed with care, and not to be done rashly or in disorder, but at fixed times and seasons. And where and by whom He would have them performed, He Himself fixed by His supreme will: that all things being done with piety according to His good pleasure might be acceptable to His will. They therefore that make their offerings at the appointed seasons are acceptable and blessed: for while they follow the institutions of the Master they cannot go wrong. For unto the high priest his proper services have been assigned, and to the priests their proper office is appointed, and upon the levites their proper ministrations are laid. The layman is bound by the layman's ordinances' (40).

The natural interpretation is that in the Christian as in the Jewish church there are persons corresponding to each order: high priests, priests, levites and laymen. The threefold repetition of 'proper' would be curious if no 'proper' significance is to be attached to each function, and the comparison is only general. We notice that the 'ministrations' of the levites are described by the word which is akin to 'deacon.' The word translated 'laymen,' again, is never used of Jews, but becomes a common Christian term. It never appears in the Septuagint, and though it is found in other Greek versions of the Old Testament, it never has a meaning comparable with the technical sense. Clement, it would seem, is not only using Jewish designations with a Christian significance, but is employing Christian terminology to describe the state of things under the old covenant.

In several places Clement speaks of Jesus as the High priest : ‘ Jesus Christ the High priest of our offerings ’ (36), ‘ the High priest and Guardian of our souls, Jesus Christ ’ (61), ‘ Our High priest and Guardian Jesus Christ ’ (64), the title being taken doubtless from the epistle to the Hebrews, where it is very common. That the reference is to Jesus in the passage under discussion is impossible, for He is entirely free from the limitations of function which are the sole ground of Clement’s use of the comparison. The equivalent to the Jewish high priest must be found in the ranks of the Christian ministry. In the *Didache* ‘ the prophets and teachers ’ are ‘ high priests ’ (xiii. 3), and the identification is traceable to Acts (xiii. 1–2). These prophets and teachers, as we saw, are to be identified with ‘ the leaders ’ who spake the word of God, mentioned in the epistle to the Hebrews (xiii. 7). Of these leaders we hear also several times in the epistle of Clement. ‘ Ye walked after the ordinances of God, submitting yourselves to your leaders and rendering to the elders among you the honour which is their due. On the young too ye enjoined modest and seemly thoughts : and the women ye charged to perform all their duties in a blameless and seemly and pure conscience ’ (1). ‘ Let us reverence our leaders ; let us honour our elders ; let us instruct our young men in the lesson of the fear of God ; let us guide our women toward that which is good ’ (21).

We notice that the ‘ leaders ’ and the ‘ elders,’ alike apparently, are people in authority, while the young men and women are subordinate. 'Honour,' we remember, is the word generally used to express the traditional view of the right attitude towards elders, whether Jewish or Christian. In both passages of Clement, surely beyond question, there is allusion to the exhortations of the apostles: of Paul, 'Let the elders that rule well be counted worthy of double honour' (I. Tim. v. 17); of Peter, 'Ye younger, be subject unto the elders' (I. Pet. v. 5). The suggestion that by 'elders' Clement is referring merely to old men is contrary to the main reason for the existence of the epistle, which was to exhort the Corinthians to a right attitude not towards the aged but towards those who are technically elders, and is also negatived by the fact that in the passage from I. Peter, of which the words are an echo, there is no such limitation, the technical use of the title being unmistakable, even though the etymological meaning is not entirely forgotten, Peter as well as Clement contrasting elders and young men.

Probably in early days the elders of the church were in many cases literally the older men of the congregation. The letter from the council of Jerusalem, we remember, was written in the name of 'the apostles and the elder brethren' (Acts xv. 23). The seventy elders appointed by Moses in the wilderness were, it would seem, chosen from men already elders in the literal sense: 'Gather unto me seventy men of the elders of Israel, whom thou knowest to be the elders of the people' (Num. xi. 16). According to Josephus the elders chosen to translate the Old Testament into Greek were actually elders in age. 'Thou wilt therefore do well to choose out and send to me men of a good character, who are now elders in age. . . . These by their age must be skilful in the laws.'[1] The same was true when Josephus chose his council of seventy in Galilee. 'He chose out seventy of the most prudent men, and those elders in age, and appointed them to be rulers of all Galilee.'[2] Among the Jews, according to the Talmud, a man could not be a rabbi, or elder, unless 'of a considerable age.'[1] It is not improbable, therefore, that a similar rule obtained in the early church, at any rate normally, so that the etymological meaning of the word was never entirely inapplicable.

---

[1] *Ant.* XII. ii. 5.

[2] *Wars*, II. xx. 5.

Polycarp also, as well as Peter and Clement, contrasts the younger men and the elders, and the elders are beyond reasonable doubt the ministers so called and not merely elderly Christians. 'In like manner also the younger men must be blameless in all things, caring for purity before everything and curbing themselves from every evil. . . . And the elders also must be compassionate, merciful towards all men, turning back the sheep that are gone astray, visiting all the infirm, not neglecting a widow or an orphan or a poor man.'[2]

It is clear that 'the leaders' of whom Clement speaks are not to be identified with the elders, who in each of the passages are mentioned immediately after them. They must be as distinct from one another as the young men and the women who form another pair in the sentences which follow. The dependence of the epistle of Clement on that to the Hebrews is beyond question very great, so that we should expect words to be used in much the same sense and particularly in a similar context. There we read, 'Obey your leaders, and submit to them' (xiii. 17), which in substance, if not entirely in word, agrees with Clement's words, 'submitting yourselves to your leaders.' In the epistle to the Hebrews, we decided, 'the leaders' are apostles, prophets or teachers, like Paul and Barnabas, Silas and Judas, who were 'leading men among the brethren' (Acts xv. 22). In the *Didache* we recognise them in the highest of the three orders of the Christian ministry, who are said to be 'high priests.' The Christian parallel to the Jewish high priest in the mind of Clement is surely beyond doubt. He must be referring to those whom elsewhere he calls ‘ the leaders,’ and to those who in Acts and the epistle to the Hebrews are called by the same title.

---

[1] On Bab. *Sanh.*, I. 6, p. 40.

[2] *Phil.* 5–6.

We must compare what we find in another passage : ‘ Therefore it is right for us to give heed to so great and so many examples, and to submit the neck, and occupying the place of obedience to take our part with them that are the leaders of our souls, that ceasing from this foolish dissension we may attain unto the goal which lieth before us in truthfulness, keeping aloof from every fault. For ye will give us great joy and gladness, if ye render obedience unto the things written by us through the Holy Spirit, and root out the unrighteous anger of your jealousy, according to the entreaty which we have made for peace and concord in this letter ’ (63).

Unfortunately the Greek for ‘ the leaders of our souls ’ is wanting. The word for ‘ leaders,’ however, in the Syriac is that used elsewhere in the epistle (1) for the ‘ leaders ’ of the Christian ministry, as also for secular ‘ leaders ’ (32, 37 *bis*, 55). It translates also the ‘ leaders ’ of the Christian church in the Syriac of the epistle to the Hebrews (xiii. 7, 17, 24). For the ‘ leaders ’ of the faction at Corinth quite different words are used both in the Greek and in the Syriac of Clement (14, 51). It seems clear, then, that ‘ the leaders of our souls ’ are the ministers of highest rank in the church, as elsewhere in the epistle (1, 21), in the epistle to the Hebrews, and indeed in Acts (xv. 22). As obedience to ‘ the leaders of our souls ’ is identical with ‘ obedience unto the things written by us through the Holy Spirit,’ the writer of the epistle is evidently himself a ‘ leader.’ As he writes ‘ through the Holy Spirit,’ he is also a prophet (cf. 59). We think of Judas and Silas, who were both ‘ leaders ’ and ‘ prophets ’ (Acts, xv. 22, 32), elders of the great church as distinct from the local church. It is as an elder of the great church therefore that the writer of the epistle addresses the church of Corinth.

Words he uses at the beginning of the epistle seem to suggest that the writer had been at Corinth himself at some previous occasion. ‘ For who that had sojourned among you did not approve your most virtuous and steadfast faith ? Who did not admire your sober and forbearing piety in Christ ? Who did not publish abroad your magnificent disposition of hospitality ? Who did not congratulate you on your perfect and sound knowledge ? For ye did all things without respect of persons, and ye walked after the ordinances of God, submitting yourselves to your leaders and rendering to the elders among you the honour which is their due ’ (1). All this sounds like personal experience, but as the epistle was an epistle of ‘ the church of God which sojourneth in Rome to the church of God which sojourneth in Corinth,’ the writer was unable to say this directly. We remember St. Paul’s mention of Clement and the rest of his fellow-workers, ‘ whose names are in the book of life,’ in the epistle to the Philippians (iv. 3), the descriptive clause suggesting, as we noticed, that like the seventy (Luke x. 20) they were elders of the great church (cf. Num. xi. 25–26). If in earlier days, as an elder of the great church, Clement had visited the church of Philippi, it is at any rate not improbable that he had visited the church of Corinth in the same way. If so, the submission to their leaders of which he speaks would be submission to Clement and his fellow elders of the great church. We notice that he speaks of ‘ your leaders,’ but of ‘ the elders that are among you,’ these latter being thus plainly designated as local officers, whereas the leaders, if our hypothesis is correct, would be itinerant, those ‘ that had sojourned among you,’ as Clement says.

Clement’s account of the origin of the Christian ministry is highly important, and must be given in full. ‘ The apostles received the gospel for us from the Lord Jesus Christ ; Jesus Christ was sent forth from God. So then Christ is from God, and the apostles are from Christ. Both therefore came of the will of God in the appointed order. Having therefore received a charge, and having been fully assured through the resurrection of our Lord Jesus Christ and confirmed in the word of God with full assurance of the Holy Ghost, they went forth with the glad tidings that the kingdom of God should come. So preaching everywhere in country and town, they appointed their firstfruits, when they had proved them by the Spirit, to be bishops and deacons unto them that should believe. And this they did in no new fashion; for indeed it had been written concerning bishops and deacons from very ancient times; for thus saith the scripture in a certain place, I will appoint their bishops in righteousness and their deacons in faith (cf. Is. lx. 17). And what marvel, if they which were entrusted in Christ with such a work by God appointed the aforesaid persons? seeing that even the blessed Moses who was a faithful servant in all His house (Num. xii. 7) recorded for a sign in the sacred books all things that were enjoined upon him. And him also the rest of the prophets followed, bearing witness with him unto the laws that were ordained by him. . . . And our apostles knew through our Lord Jesus Christ that there would be strife over the name of the bishop's office. For this cause therefore, having received complete foreknowledge, they appointed the aforesaid persons, and afterwards gave an after-law, that if these should fall asleep, other approved men should succeed to their ministration. Those therefore who were appointed by them, or afterward by other men on the roll, with the consent of the whole church, and have ministered unblameably to the flock of Christ in lowliness of mind, peacefully and with all modesty, and for long time have borne a good report with all—these men we consider to be unjustly thrust out from their ministration. For it will be no light sin for us, if we thrust out of the bishop's office those who have offered the gifts unblameably and holily. Blessed are those elders who have gone before, seeing that their departure was fruitful and ripe : for they have no fear lest any one should remove them from their appointed place. For we see that ye have displaced certain persons, though they were living virtuously, from the ministration which they had honoured blamelessly ' (42–44).

It is plain that as in the New Testament ' bishops ' and ' elders ' are identical, that those who exercise the ' bishop's office ' are ' elders.' As in the *Didache* the primary duty of the bishop is to celebrate the eucharist, to ' offer the gifts.'

The connexion of the epistle of Clement with the *Didache* does not seem to be commonly noticed. Yet there can be little doubt that Clement had the *Didache* in mind when he penned the above passage. There are indeed various echoes of thought and phraseology. Properly they should be compared in the Greek.

Clement	*Didache*
Let each of you . . . give thanks unto God . . . not transgressing.	Give thanks, first confessing your transgressions.
Not everywhere are offered sacrifices . . . the offering is not made in every place.	In every place . . . offer me a pure sacrifice.
Through the high priest and the aforesaid ministers.	For they are your high priests.
The aforesaid ministers . . . the aforesaid persons . . . the aforesaid persons.	The aforesaid things.
They appointed their firstfruits.	Every firstfruit . . . thou shalt take and give as the firstfruit.
When they had approved them by the Spirit . . . other approved men.	Every prophet approved . . . men . . . true and approved.
They appointed . . . bishops and deacons . . . concerning bishops and deacons.	Appoint for yourselves therefore bishops and deacons.
What wonderful thing.	My name is wonderful.
He did so.	So do ye.

To their ministration . . . and have ministered unblameably . . . from their ministration . . . from the ministration.	They also minister the ministration.
Who have offered the gifts.	Offer me a pure sacrifice.
The ministration which they had honoured.	They also minister the ministration for they are your honoured men.

At this point the phraseology of the epistle of Clement is remarkably similar to what we find in the *Didache*. Other similarities are to be found elsewhere.

Although he does not quote it directly, it is plain that the prophecy of Malachi (i. 11) lies behind Clement's discussion of the place of sacrifice, as in the *Didache*, where it is given in full. Both compare the highest order of Christian ministers with the high priest of the old covenant. The mention of ' firstfruits ' in the *Didache* would suggest the thought to the writer of the epistle, but he gives the word the significance applied to it by St. Paul in the first epistle to the Corinthians. ' Now I beseech you, brethren (ye know the house of Stephanas, that it is the firstfruits of Achaia, and that they have set themselves to minister unto the saints), that ye also be in subjection unto such, and to every one that helpeth in the work and laboureth. And I rejoice at the coming of Stephanas and Fortunatus and Achaicus ' (xvi. 15–17). The household of Stephanas, baptized by St. Paul himself (i. 16), had evidently supplied several members of the ministry, and it is this fact which Clement has in mind. Special interest therefore attaches to the final admonition of the epistle : ' Now send ye back speedily unto us our messengers Claudius Ephebus and Valerius Bito, together with Fortunatus also, in peace and with joy ' (65). It seems quite probable that Paul and Clement are referring to the same Fortunatus, apparently an elder of the church of Corinth.

In the *Didache* the ministers of highest rank are called ‘prophets,’ ‘apostles and prophets,’ ‘prophets and teachers.’ In Clement too those to whom was entrusted the appointment of bishops and deacons, the apostles, are regarded also as prophets, or as having prophetic powers. ‘Confirmed in the word of God with full assurance of the Holy Ghost, they went forth. . . . So preaching everywhere in country and town, they appointed their firstfruits, when they had proved them by the Spirit.’ Their prototype is to be found in Moses, ‘a faithful servant in all His house,’ a prophet and yet greater than a prophet. ‘If there be a prophet among you, I the Lord will make myself known unto him in a vision, I will speak with him in a dream. My servant Moses is not so ; he is faithful in all mine house’ (Num. xii. 6–7). The great fact of the New Testament, as we have seen, in the realm of organisation, is that Jesus is the new Moses (cf. Heb. iii. 2–6). It is, according to Clement, because they were ‘entrusted in Christ with such a work by God,’ that the apostles appointed bishops and deacons. They were carrying on the work of the new Moses. The promise had been, ‘The Lord thy God will raise up unto thee a prophet from the midst of thee, of thy brethren, like unto me ; unto him ye shall hearken’ (Deut. xviii. 15). It is as a prophet, as we have seen, that Clement claims the obedience of the Corinthians, ‘Ye will give us great joy and gladness, if ye render obedience unto the things written by us through the Holy Spirit’ (63). Elsewhere also he lays emphasis on this point. ‘If certain persons should be disobedient unto the words spoken by Him through us, let them understand that they will entangle themselves in no slight transgression and danger’ (59).

Clement traces the parallel between Moses and the apostles still further, not only in the appointment of bishops and deacons, but also in writing down what had been commanded. ‘And what marvel, if they which were entrusted in Christ with such a work by God appointed the aforesaid persons ? seeing that even the blessed Moses . . . recorded for a sign in the sacred books all things that were enjoined upon him. . . . For this cause therefore, having received complete foreknowledge, they appointed the aforesaid persons, and afterwards gave an after-law, that if these should fall asleep, other approved men should succeed to their ministration ' (43–44). As Moses determined who should be priests and ministers unto God, so the apostles appointed bishops and deacons, and as he recorded what he had done in the sacred books among ' the laws that were ordained by him,' so they wrote down what they had done as an addition to the law. What is this ' after-law ' of which Clement speaks ? In view of his dependence upon the *Didache* for both thought and phraseology at this point it can hardly be anything else than this work, which claims to be ' The teaching of the twelve apostles ' and to give rules concerning the ministry ' according to the ordinance of the Gospel.'

The next words of Clement seem to be a combination of a passage of the *Didache* with a statement of Acts. ' Those therefore who were appointed by them, or afterward by other men on the roll, with the consent of the whole church, and have ministered unblameably to the flock of Christ . . . we consider to be unjustly thrust out from their ministration ' (44). ' Appoint for yourselves therefore bishops and deacons . . . for unto you they also minister the ministration of the prophets and teachers ' (xv. 1). ' Now there were . . . prophets and teachers, Barnabas . . . and Saul. . . . And when they had appointed for them elders in every church . . . they commended them to the Lord ' (Acts xiii. 1, xiv. 23). ' Those therefore who were appointed by them . . . with the consent of the whole church ' seems to be an attempt to reconcile, ' Appoint for yourselves therefore bishops and deacons,' and ' they appointed for them elders in every church.' The precept of the *Didache* is evidently the basis of Clement's argument.

Who are the ' other men on the roll ' ? The Greek word rendered ‘ on the roll ’ is usually translated ‘ of repute ’ in this context, a meaning the superlative may perhaps have elsewhere in the epistle, ‘ of the highest repute ’ (62). In other places, however, it has the more literal and etymological meaning ‘ on the roll.’ ‘ It is better for you to be found little in the flock of Christ and to have your name on the roll, than to be had in exceeding honour and yet be cast out from the hope of Him ’ (57). ‘ As God liveth, and the Lord Jesus Christ liveth, and the Holy Spirit, who are the faith and the hope of the elect, so surely shall he, who with lowliness of mind and instant in gentleness hath without regretfulness performed the ordinances and commandments that are given by God, be registered and on the roll among the number of them that are saved through Jesus Christ ’ (58). Clement is fond of speaking of ‘ the elect,’ and uses the adjective some seven times (1, 2, 6, 46, 49, 52, 59). On two occasions he uses the phrase, ‘ the number of the elect,’ ‘ that the number of His elect might be saved ’ (2), ‘ that the Creator of the universe may guard intact unto the end the number that hath been numbered of His elect ’ (59). Clement’s idea of the roll of the elect of God is apparently that of the epistle to the Hebrews, which he uses so frequently, where we read of ‘ the general assembly and church of the firstborn who are enrolled in heaven ’ (xii. 23). As he lays such emphasis on the thought, it would be very unnatural in his discussion of the ministry to translate a word, which he uses elsewhere with the meaning ‘ on the roll,’ otherwise, so that we must regard him as saying that the bishops and deacons were appointed not merely by ‘ men of repute ’ but by ‘ men on the roll,’ whatever be the exact significance of the words.

We notice that Clement speaks of ‘ other men on the roll,’ his primary reference being to the apostles. We remember our Lord’s words on the return of the seventy, ‘ Rejoice that your names are written in heaven ’ (Luke x. 20). The apostles and the rest of the seventy were thus the first ‘ men on the roll.’ Writing to the Philippians St. Paul speaks similarly of a Clement who not improbably is to be identified with the author of the epistle : ‘ Clement, and the rest of my fellow-workers, whose names are in the book of life ’ (iv. 3). We are carried back, as we have recognised above, to the story of Moses and the seventy elders in the wilderness, ‘ They were of them that were written ’ (Num. xi. 26), and the prayer of Moses, ‘ If not, blot me, I pray thee, out of thy book which thou hast written ’ (Exod. xxxii. 32). The ‘ men on the roll ’ are thus the elders of the great church, the successors of the apostles and the seventy, of Barnabas and Paul, Judas and Silas, and Clement the writer of the epistle is himself apparently one. They are identical with ‘ the leaders ’ of whom Clement speaks elsewhere, using a designation found in the gospel, Acts and the epistle to the Hebrews, an order of ministers to which on other grounds we have decided that Clement belonged.

There are several other references to the elders in the epistle. ‘ It is shameful . . . that it should be reported that the very steadfast and ancient church of the Corinthians, for the sake of one or two persons, maketh sedition against its elders ’ (47). ‘ Only let the flock of Christ be at peace with its duly appointed elders ’ (54). ‘ Ye therefore that laid the foundation of the sedition, submit yourselves unto the elders ’ (57). Again we notice the emphasis which Clement lays on the fact that the elders against which there is sedition were ‘ duly appointed.’ An admonition of the first epistle of St. Peter is given a particular application, ‘ Submit yourselves unto the elders ’ (v. 5).

It is noteworthy that there is nothing which suggests that at Corinth there are any resident ministers of higher rank than the elders, or bishops. Clement speaks of the submission of the church to its leaders in time past in words which suggest that he himself was numbered among them (1), and he claims their obedience in the present as one who had the authority of God (59, 63), plainly ranking himself above the elders. He writes, indeed, not as an outsider venturing somewhat apologetically to interfere in the affairs of another church, but as one who was merely doing his duty, and his apology is that as a result of the difficulties through which the church of Rome has been passing he has seemed to be neglectful. 'By reason of the sudden and repeated calamities and reverses which are befalling us, brethren, we consider that we have been somewhat tardy in giving heed to the matters of dispute that have arisen among you' (1). Yet his authority is not simply personal. The letter is not written in his own name, but in that of the church of Rome, 'The church of God which sojourneth in Rome to the church of God which sojourneth in Corinth.' There is no allusion to any presiding officer in either case, and so apparently there was at Rome no one resident leader who could without qualification be regarded as representing the church any more than at Corinth. It is the church of Rome which claims authority over the church of Corinth, not any one officer, and clearly not the writer of the letter by himself. The church of Rome would seem to provide 'the leaders' of the church of Corinth, Clement being one. Presumably they were the elders of the church of Rome. In other words the church of Rome was a metropolitical church, like the church of Jerusalem, and the elders of the church of Rome were elders of the great church. This is the conclusion we have reached already by a study of the first epistle of St. Peter, where we found that Peter, 'the fellow elder,' speaks of himself as a high priest wearing the petalon (I. v. 1), like James at Jerusalem according to Hegesippus,[1] and John at Ephesus according to Polycrates.[2]

Our examination of the evidence provided by the epistle of Clement seems to shew that at Corinth there were two orders of local ministers, bishops or elders, and deacons. The same was true presumably at Rome, but the ministers of the church of Rome were of a higher rank than those of the church of Corinth, and had authority over them, the elders of the church of Rome being 'the leaders' of the church of Corinth. The church of Corinth, therefore, was ruled by three orders of ministers, (1) 'the leaders' or 'men on the roll' who were non-local, (2) bishops or elders, and (3) deacons who were local officers. We have assumed that Clement was actually the writer of the epistle commonly attributed to him, at any rate since the days of Dionysius of Corinth (*c.* 170)[1]; but, even if it were proved to be otherwise, it would make no serious difference to our conclusions.

---

[1] Epiphanius, *Haer.* xxix. 4, lxxviii. 14. See p. 187.

[2] Eusebius, *Ecc. Hist.* v. xxiv. 3. See p. 189.

---

[1] Eusebius, *Ecc. Hist.* IV. xxiii. 2.

CHAPTER III

THE 'SHEPHERD' OF HERMAS

At this point we may consider the evidence afforded by the *Shepherd* of Hermas. Hermas has been identified with the Hermas whom St. Paul salutes in the last chapter of the epistle to the Romans (xvi. 14), and the Clement he mentions with the Clement of the epistle to the Philippians (iv. 3), and the writer of the epistle of Clement to the Corinthians. The identification of Hermas is not very probable, for Hermas was a common name, and the last chapter of Romans, it is not unlikely, was a short epistle commending Phœbe to the Ephesians, not to the Romans. That the Clement is intended to be the writer of the epistle to the Corinthians is much more probable, and, if so, according to our argument the further identification follows. If this be true the statement of the Muratorian fragment that 'The *Shepherd* was written quite recently in our own times by Hermas, while Pius the bishop his brother was sitting in the chair of the church of the city of Rome,'[1] cannot be correct. Internal evidence also seems against so late a date (*c.* 150), and the identification of Hermas with the brother of Pius was perhaps somewhat lightly made because it afforded a convenient way of disparaging the document, just as in a similar way the earlier method of appointing a patriarch at Alexandria was conveniently supposed to apply to Athanasius.[2]

Hermas is bidden write a message for 'the elect of

---

[1] Westcott, *History of the Canon*, App. C., p. 563. [2] See p. 243.

God' throughout the world. The church conceived under the symbol of an aged woman is described as saying, 'Now, therefore, I say unto you that are the leaders of the church and that occupy the chief seats.' [1] The word translated 'leaders' is that used, both with the prefix, as in the *Shepherd*, and without, to describe presumably the same officers of the church, the ministers of highest rank, in the epistle of Clement (1, 21, 63), the same word without the prefix being employed with a like significance in St. Luke (xxii. 26), Acts (xv. 22), and the epistle to the Hebrews (xiii. 7, 17, 24). Those 'that occupy the chief seats' are apparently the elders of local churches. We remember the description of the scribes, in particular it would seem the local elders of the Jews, as 'loving the chief seats in the synagogues' (Luke xx. 46; cf. xi. 43). Hermas gives a similar criticism of a false prophet, 'That man who seemeth to have a spirit exalteth himself, and desireth to have a chief seat.[2]

There is also mention of bishops. 'They that believed are such as these: bishops, hospitable persons, who gladly received into their houses at all times the servants of God without hypocrisy. (These bishops) at all times without ceasing sheltered the needy and the widows in their ministration and conducted themselves in purity at all times.' [3] The description is obviously based largely on the phraseology of the Pastoral Epistles. Writing both to Timothy and to Titus, St. Paul says a bishop must be 'given to hospitality' (I. Tim. iii. 2; Titus i. 8). We note, too, the references to 'the houses' of bishops (I. Tim. iii. 4, 5), duty towards 'widows' (I. Tim. v. 3–16), 'the servants of God' or 'of the Lord' (II. Tim. ii. 24; Titus i. 1), 'hypocrisy' (I. Tim. iv. 2), 'shelter' (I. Tim. vi. 8), 'ministration' (I. Tim. i. 12; II. Tim. iv. 5, 11), 'conduct' of life (I. Tim. iii. 15; iv. 12), 'purity' of life (I. Tim. v. 22; Titus ii. 5). In the Pastoral Epistles 'bishops' and 'elders' are identical

---

[1] *Vis.* III. ix. 7. [2] *Mand.* xi. 12. [3] *Sim.* IX. xxvii. 1–2.

(I. Tim. iii. 1–7, v. 1, 17–20 ; Titus i. 5–9). The suggestion is that it is the same in Hermas. We read, ‘ The aged woman came, and asked me, if I had already given the book to the elders. . . . Thou shalt therefore write two little books, and shalt send one to Clement, and one to Grapte. Clement therefore shall send to the foreign cities, for to him it has been entrusted ; while Grapte shall instruct the widows and the orphans. But thou shalt read (the book) to this city along with the elders that preside over the church.’ [1] Clement is apparently an elder, and Grapte a deaconess, who, under the bishops, has care of the widows. In Rome, it would seem, the ‘ elders ’ are ‘ bishops,’ for there is here no suggestion of a higher order.

Deacons also are mentioned as performing their normal functions as almoners. ‘ They that have the spots are deacons that exercised their office ill, and plundered the livelihood of widows and orphans, and made gain for themselves from the ministrations which they had received to perform.’ [2] Again we notice the phraseology of the Pastoral Epistles.

Hermas tells us too of ‘ apostles and teachers, who preached unto the whole world, and who taught the word of the Lord in soberness and purity, and kept back no part at all for evil desire, but walked always in righteousness and truth, even as also they received the Holy Spirit.’ [3] The influence of the Pastoral Epistles is again obvious, and particularly St. Paul’s description of himself. ‘ I was appointed a preacher and an apostle . . . a teacher of the Gentiles in faith and truth ’ (I. Tim. ii. 7 ; II. Tim. i. 11). The apostles and teachers clearly belong to a past generation. There are other references to them and their work, which is always described in the phraseology of the Pastoral Epistles. ‘ The forty [stones] are apostles and teachers of the preaching of the Son of God.’ [4] ‘ These [the forty stones], the apostles and the teachers who preached the name of the Son of God, after they had fallen asleep in the power and faith of the Son of God, preached also to them that had fallen asleep before them.' [1] St. Paul was both an apostle and teacher, but it is plain that apostles and teachers are not necessarily identical, each noun being preceded by the article. Yet the apostles are mentioned alone. 'To these then the Son of God was preached by the apostles.' [2] These passages, however, give us no information about the ministry of the church in the days of Hermas.

---

[1] *Vis.* II. iv. 2–3.

[2] *Sim.* IX. xxvi. 2.

[3] *Sim.* IX. xxv. 2.

[4] *Sim.* IX. xv. 4.

In another place Hermas gives us a longer list of ministers of the church. 'These are the apostles and bishops and teachers and deacons, who walked after the holiness of God, and exercised their office of bishop and teacher and deacon in purity and sanctity for the elect of God, some of them already fallen on sleep, and others still living.' [3] The apostles and teachers must include the apostles and teachers mentioned elsewhere in the book, who did work comparable with that of St. Paul, and so are able to be described in like words from the Pastoral Epistles. The bishops and deacons likewise must include the bishops and deacons of whom he speaks elsewhere, having in mind what is said of them in the Pastoral Epistles. Yet in each case presumably there is a further reference, not simply to those 'fallen on sleep,' but to those 'still living.' He does not speak of 'apostles and teachers and bishops and deacons,' but of 'apostles and bishops and teachers and deacons,' and this presumably to make the list agree with what he says afterwards when he speaks of the 'office of bishop and teacher and deacon.' A 'bishop' (in the inferior sense) must be 'apt to teach,' and the elders 'who labour in the word and in teaching' are 'worthy of double honour' (I. Tim. iii. 2, v. 17). 'Bishop and teacher and deacon' therefore, when interpreted of the living, would seem to refer to the three orders of bishop, elder and deacon. The double interpretation of his words, according to old and new conditions, was evidently in the author's mind when he framed the sentence. In each case apparently there is a threefold ministry: (1) apostles, (2) bishops (local elders), (3) deacons, and (1) bishops, (2) teachers (local elders), (3) deacons.

---

[1] *Sim.* IX. xvi. 5.

[2] *Sim.* IX. xvii. 1.

[3] *Vis.* III. v. 1.

Yet the threefold ministry does not seem to exist in Rome itself. In the message which Hermas was to deliver to the elect we read, 'Thou shalt therefore say unto the leaders of the church, that they direct their paths in righteousness.' [1] Later he tells us 'The aged woman came, and asked me, if I had already given the book to the elders.' [2] 'The leaders of the church' are evidently identical with 'the elders,' and so with those 'that occupy the chief seats,' mentioned with 'the leaders of the church' elsewhere.[3] The conclusion of the aged lady's instruction is, 'Thou shalt read (the book) to this city along with the elders that preside over the church.' [4] St. Paul's words to Timothy are clearly behind the saying, 'If a man knoweth not how to preside over his own house, how shall he take care of the church of God? . . . Let the elders that preside well be counted worthy of double honour' (I. Tim. iii. 5, v. 17). Hermas himself, by whose means the words of the book are to be made known to all the elect, is given his place later among the elders [5] who are to be responsible for its publication to the world. Consequently, the words of St. Paul immediately preceding the last extract throw a flood of light upon the significance of much that we are told in the book, which is otherwise rather strange. 'The bishop therefore must be without reproach . . . one that presideth well over his own house, having his children in subjection with all gravity' (I. Tim. iii. 2, 4). This was the great trouble of Hermas. His family, his 'whole house,' [6] were very far from being in subjection. This is worthy of notice chiefly because he becomes one of 'the elders that preside over the church' of Rome, and so one of 'the leaders of the church' which has authority even over 'the foreign cities,' to which it is Clement's duty to write. Again we have evidence that the church of Rome was a metropolitical church, like Jerusalem and Antioch, the elders being elders of the great church, or bishops, ministers of the highest rank in the church.

---

[1] *Vis.* II. ii. 6.

[2] *Vis.* II. iv. 2.

[3] *Vis.* III. ix. 7.

[4] *Vis.* II. iv. 3.

[5] *Vis.* III. i. 8–9.

[6] *Vis.* I. i. 9.

Elders of the great church were prophets—this was their distinctive title, in the New Testament and in the *Didache.* Hermas writes as a prophet, and the *Shepherd* is a collection of prophecies. As an elder he is thus true to his calling. The elders of the church alone are the true prophets, so he teaches. 'He shewed me men seated on a couch, and another man seated on a chair. And he saith to me, Seest thou those that are seated on the couch? I see them, sir, say I. These, saith he, are faithful, but he that sitteth on the chair is a false prophet who destroyeth the mind of the servants of God.'[1] The men seated on the couch are the elders of the church seated on the bench of the elders, as in a Jewish synagogue and in an early Christian church (Rev. iv. 4). The desire of the false prophet 'to have a chief seat' is the wish to become an elder of the church, an office for which his supposed prophetic powers qualify him, so he imagines. The qualifications for office in the church according to the New Testament, the *Didache* and the epistle of Clement, is the possession of 'the spirit,' as in the case of Joshua (Num. xxvii. 18), for in such only can the prophetic Spirit of God have full course. The prophetic powers of the true prophet are exercised in the 'assembly of righteous men,' that is, in the gathering together of the church of which he is a 'leader.' So presumably prophesied Hermas himself.

Hermas gives instructions for the proving of prophets, not dissimilar from those found in the *Didache,* with which he seems to have been familiar. 'How then, sir, say I, shall a man know who of them is a prophet, and who a false prophet ? Hear, saith he, concerning both the prophets ; and, as I shall tell thee, so shalt thou test the prophet and the false prophet. By his life test the man that hath the divine Spirit. . . . When then the man who hath the divine Spirit cometh into an assembly of righteous men, who have faith in a divine Spirit, and intercession is made to God by the gathering of those men, then the angel of the prophetic spirit, who is attached to him, filleth the man, and the man, being filled with the Holy Spirit, speaketh to the multitude, according as the Lord willeth. In this way then the Spirit of the deity shall be manifest. . . . That man who seemeth to have a spirit exalteth himself, and desireth to have a chief seat. . . . But when he comes into an assembly full of righteous men who have a Spirit of deity, and intercession is made for them, that man is emptied, and the earthly spirit fleeth from him in fear, and that man is struck dumb and is altogether broken in pieces, being unable to utter a word. . . . Therefore test, by his life and his works, the man who says that he is moved by the Spirit.' [1]

---

[1] *Mand.* xi. 1.

The ' prophet ' is one whose prophetic powers have been attested and approved, and in consequence has been called to sit on the seats of the elders, on the couch, or bench, of the church. Hermas was one of these, and likewise presumably Clement also, elders of the church of Rome and so of the great church, ' prophets ' according to the terminology of the Acts and the *Didache*, ' bishops ' from the point of view of order because belonging to the highest rank of ministers, though not necessarily diocesan bishops, the bishop in this sense in a metropolitical church being the presiding or ruling elder. The evidence of the *Shepherd* fits in exactly with what we have concluded was the organisation of the primitive church from a study of other documents.

---

[1] *Mand.* xi. 7, 9–10, 12, 14, 16. Cf. pp. 147–48, 150–51 above.

CHAPTER IV

PAPIAS, HEGESIPPUS, AND POLYCRATES

I.—PAPIAS

We will now consider the evidence afforded by a passage from Papias, bishop of Hierapolis (*c.* 130), preserved by Eusebius, which is important, not only for the early history of the gospels, but also for that of the Christian ministry: 'But I will not scruple also to give a place for you together with my interpretations to whatever things I learned carefully and remembered carefully in time past from the elders, guaranteeing their truth. . . . And again if at any time any one came who had been a follower of the elders I would inquire about the words of the elders, what Andrew or what Peter said, or what Philip, or what Thomas or James or what John or Matthew, or any other of the disciples of the Lord, and what things Aristion and the older John, the disciples of the Lord, were saying.'[1]

The construction is somewhat involved, but it would seem that Papias inquired about two things: the words of the elders, and what Aristion and the older John were saying. The words of the elders are explained as being the sayings of certain of the apostles, presumably to the elders. In the Greek different pronouns are used for 'what' the apostles said, and 'what things' Aristion and John were saying, so that on grammatical grounds as well as from the general sense it is not likely that Papias means us to understand that the words of the elders reported the sayings of Aristion and John as well as of the apostles. Aristion and John presumably were elders, but unlike the other elders were associated with the apostles as being also disciples of the Lord. We notice, however, that Papias does not speak of 'John the elder,' but of 'the older John.' The Greek seems to require this translation, and it is the rendering given by St. Jerome, 'the senior John.'[1] The point is that the John associated with Aristion is older than some other John, known to Papias and his readers, who at this point is not further mentioned. Papias has three Johns in view: John the apostle, already dead; the older John and a younger John, still living when he made his inquiries.

---

[1] *Ecc. Hist.* III. xxxix. 3–4.

The elders, it would seem, were not apostles, but disciples of apostles, so Irenæus tells us in several places.[2] Two of them were themselves disciples of the Lord, and so primary sources of information about Jesus, but the rest could only report what they had heard the apostles and other disciples of the Lord say. The chain of tradition at its longest is, Jesus, the apostles and disciples of the Lord, the elders, the informants of Papias, Papias. It might be shorter, however, for, as we have seen, two of the elders were themselves disciples of the Lord, and Papias had not always had need to rely on the reports of others with regard to the words of the elders but had heard them himself.

The title 'elders' can have only one meaning, that they were elders not of a local church but of the great church. Later Eusebius quotes from Papias a tradition with regard to the origin of the gospels which he introduces with the words, 'And this the elder used to say.' 'Mark having become the interpreter of Peter wrote down accurately, not however in order, whatever he remembered of the things either said or done by Christ.'[3] The author of this statement was hardly himself a disciple of the Lord, and so presumably was the younger rather than the older John of the two Papias had in mind. It is impossible to give the arguments here, but we may give the conclusions arrived at elsewhere.[1]

---

[1] *De Vir. Ill.* xviii.
[2] See pp. 214–15.
[3] III. xxxix. 15.

The apostle John, the disciple of the Lord, is the original author of the fourth gospel. The older John of Papias, also a disciple of the Lord, is the prophet who was the original writer of the Apocalypse. The younger John, technically 'the elder,' was the amanuensis of the apostle, the writer in his name of the first epistle which bears his name, the editor of his gospel and the Apocalypse, and the author in his own name of the second and third epistles. The apostles whom Papias mentions were original members, the disciples Aristion and the older John at any rate early members of the highest order of ministers of the great church, presumably from Jerusalem, the older John being both prophet and teacher, Aristion certainly a teacher. The younger John, 'the elder' of the epistles and Papias, was, it would seem, an Asiatic, ordained by the apostle, and by him set over the church of Ephesus,[2] and so we account for certain curious statements in the present edition of St. John's gospel. The second and third epistles, which bear his name, give glimpses of him at work in later days, and we see him rebuking Diotrephes the presiding elder of a local church under the jurisdiction of the elder of the great church localised at Ephesus. The evidence of Papias is thus in exact accord with what we have learned from the New Testament.

II.—HEGESIPPUS

Hegesippus (*c.* 160) gives us interesting information about James the Lord's brother, which is of special value for our purpose as confirming our conclusion with regard to the metropolitical status of the church of

---

[1] See *St. John's Gospel, as First Edited,* by the present writer, in preparation.

[2] Cf. *Ap. Cons.* VII. xlvi. 7. See p. 146.

Jerusalem. ‘Together with the apostles James the Lord’s brother succeeded to the church. He received the name of *the Just* from all men, from the time of the Lord even to our own: for there were many called James. Now he was holy from his mother’s womb, drank no wine nor strong drink, nor ate anything in which was life; no razor came upon his head, he anointed himself not with oil, and used no bath. To him alone it was permitted to enter the holy place; for he wore nothing woollen, but linen garments. And alone he entered into the sanctuary, and was found on his knees asking forgiveness on behalf of the people, so that his knees became hard like a camel’s, for he was continually bending the knee in worship to God, and asking forgiveness for the people. In fact, on account of his exceeding great justice he was called *the Just* and *Oblias*, which is in Greek “bulwark of the people” and “justice,” as the prophets show concerning him.’ [1]

We notice the use made of the description of John the Baptist. ‘He shall drink no wine nor strong drink; and he shall be filled with the Holy Ghost, even from his mother’s womb’ (Luke i. 15). We may also compare, ‘And John was clothed with camel’s hair . . . and did eat locusts and wild honey’ (Mark i. 6). The account of Samson in the Septuagint is also used: ‘Drink no wine nor strong drink, and eat not any unclean thing, for lo thou art with child, and shalt bear a son; and no razor shall come upon his head . . . for the child shall be holy unto God from the womb’ (Judges xiii. 5, 7). The description of the consecration of Aaron and his sons is also utilised: ‘And Moses brought near Aaron and his sons, and washed them with water. . . . And Moses poured of the anointing oil upon Aaron’s head, and anointed him, and sanctified him’ (Lev. viii. 6, 12). The account of the ceremonial on the day of atonement is likewise employed: ‘Thus shall Aaron enter into the holy place. . . . And he shall put on the consecrated linen coat, and he shall have the linen breeches upon his flesh, and he shall be girded with a linen girdle, and shall put on the linen mitre; they are holy garments ; and he shall wash all his body in water, and shall put them on. . . . And there shall be no man in the tabernacle of witness when he goeth in to make an atonement in the holy place, until he come out ' (Lev. xvi. 3, 4, 17). In the epistle to the Hebrews we read : ' The priests go in continually into the first tabernacle . . . but into the second the high priest alone, once in the year' (ix. 6–7). Details are also derived from Ezekiel's rules for the priests : ' These shall enter into my sanctuary. . . . They shall put on linen garments, and they shall not put on woollen. . . . And they shall not shave their heads . . . and no priest shall drink wine. . . . And they shall teach my people. . . . They shall justly observe my justice, and judge my judgements. . . . And after he is cleansed let him reckon to himself seven days ' (xliv. 16, 17, 20, 21, 23, 24, 26).

---

[1] Eusebius, *Ecc. Hist.* II. xxiii. 4–7.

Epiphanius gives certain details about James, presumably also derived from Hegesippus, which are omitted by Eusebius. 'Moreover we find him ministering in the priest's office according to the ancient priesthood. Therefore it was also permitted to him once in the year to enter into the holy of holies as the law commanded the high priests, according to that which is written. . . . Yea it was allowed him to wear the petalon on his head, as the aforesaid trustworthy men in the memoirs written by them bare witness.'[1] The source of these statements is exactly the same as of the information given by Eusebius. In the account of the consecration of Aaron we read : ' And he set the mitre upon his head ; and upon the mitre in front did he set the petalon ' (Lev. viii. 9). Of the ceremonies of the day of atonement we are told further : 'The priest, whomsoever they shall anoint and whomsoever they shall consecrate to minister in the priest's office after his father . . . shall put on the linen garment, even the holy garment. And he shall make atonement for the holy of holy. . . . Once in the year shall it be done' (Lev. xvi. 32–34). In Ezekiel we read of the Levites who went astray. 'And they shall not come near unto me to minister in the priest's office unto me, nor to draw near . . . unto my holy of holies' (xliv. 13).

---

[1] *Haer.* xxix. 4 ; cf. lxxviii. 14.

Hegesippus, or his source, has evidently confused certain details, but the general significance of the description is quite plain. James, like John the Baptist, is a 'prophet' (Luke i. 76, vii. 26) and a 'priest' (Luke i. 5, 13). Like Samson he was a judge (Judges xv. 20, xvi. 31), and a man of the Spirit, or prophet (Judges xiii. 25, xiv. 6, 19). Like the high priest, he was priest, teacher, and judge (Ezek. xliv. 21, 23, 24). The description, indeed, merely tells us in symbolical language that James was president of the Christian sanhedrin, chief of the elders of the new people of God, high priest, prophet, teacher and judge. Our whole investigation has pointed to this conclusion. Barnabas and Saul with others at Antioch as 'prophets and teachers' were ministering to the Lord as high priests of the new dispensation; Judas and Silas, also prophets, were 'leading men among the brethren,' which likewise suggests the high priestly office. James himself, as president of the apostles and elders, is leading judge – 'My judgement is' (Acts xv. 19).

James is called by Hegesippus 'the Just.' It is the title given in 'Pirke Aboth' to the first name in the long line of the tradition of the *Torah*, beginning with Moses and Joshua. 'Simon the Just belonged to the last of the Great Synagogue.'[1] Josephus identifies him with the brother of Eleazar, who was high priest about the year 300 B.C. 'He was called Simon the Just, because of both his piety towards God, and his kind disposition to those of his own nation.'[2] He is also to be identified, we have decided, with Simon the

[1] i. 2.

[2] *Ant.* XII. ii. 5, cf. iv. 1.

son of Onias, whose praises are sung in the book Ecclesiasticus. Of this man, in agreement with what Josephus says, we are told, ‘ It was he that took thought for his people to save them from attack, and fortified the city against besieging ’ (l. 4). This exactly explains the title ‘ Oblias,’ ‘ bulwark of the people,’ which Hegesippus tells us was applied to James. James was the first president of the sanhedrin of the new people of God, the first of a new line for the tradition of the new *Torah*, as we have seen, high priest, prophet, teacher and judge. It was natural, then, that he should be compared with the first of the Jewish line, Simon, high priest and teacher, and that the description of one should be applied to the other. So he is called ‘ James the Just,’ and ‘ Oblias,’ ‘ the bulwark of the people.’

III.—POLYCRATES

In his letter to Victor, bishop of Rome, Polycrates, bishop of Ephesus (*c.* 190), makes the same statement about the apostle John which Hegesippus makes with regard to James the Lord’s brother. ‘ And moreover John who leaned upon the bosom of the Lord, who became a priest wearing the petalon, both martyr and teacher, he fell asleep in Ephesus.’ [1] In the case of James we concluded that wearing the petalon meant that he was a Christian high priest, head of the chief priests, or prophets, of the great church, and president of the elders of the Christian sanhedrin at Jerusalem. Similarly the claim of St. Peter to be already ‘ a partaker of the glory that shall be revealed ’ (I. Pet. v. 1), we decided was a claim to wear the petalon, and therefore to possess similar authority. He too was a high priest of the Christian community, and president of the elders of the great church, apparently at Rome. If these conclusions are correct, the statement of Polycrates with respect to St. John must mean much the same thing, that he was a Christian high priest, or prophet, president of the council of the elders of the great church in Asia. The Jewish high priest, as president of the great sanhedrin of Jerusalem, was the chief authority for the determination of the new moon, and consequently the date of the passover and other festivals,[1] so that the designation of St. John as high priest is specially appropriate in a letter concerned with the right date for the observance of the Christian passover, which instances the apostle as a chief authority in support of a particular date.

---

[1] Eusebius, *Ecc. Hist.* v. xxiv. 3.

Yet presumably St. John was not president of the elders of a single metropolitical church, but of the college of bishops of the various cities in Asia in which, for the most part at any rate, these elders had been localised. Jerusalem and Rome, we have concluded, were metropolitical churches exercising jurisdiction over the churches in the regions around, the elders having authority over the local elders in their territories. Yet, it would seem, it was not quite the same at Ephesus. The authority of St. John remained purely personal, and was not in any way shared by the church of Ephesus, which kept its original status, and was never metropolitical, the elders continuing merely local elders as in the earliest days (Acts xx. 17), not elders of the great church. St. John, like St. James, held a position comparable with that of a patriarch in later days, but he was head not of a body of peripatetic elders, as at Jerusalem, but of a body of elders, for the most part at any rate, it would seem, localised, each in his own church, the first bishops in any strict sense diocesan. The statement that he wore the petalon is thus a symbolical way of saying that he held this supreme authority, high priest among the chief priests of the new people of God, president of the council of the elders of the great church in Asia, who were the bishops of his province.

---

[1] Cf. *Rosh ha-shanah*, II. 7.

We may note that the same statement is made of St. Mark. In a Passion of the evangelist it is recorded that he too wore the high priestly petalon,[1] and therefore it would seem held a position, presumably at Alexandria, comparable with that of St. James at Jerusalem, St. John in Asia and St. Peter at Rome. Apparently it means that the church of Alexandria was from the earliest days metropolitical, and the elders elders of the great church, or according to the later meaning of the word, bishops.

---

[1] Volois, on Eusebius, *Ecc. Hist.* v. xxiv. 3.

CHAPTER V

THE EPISTLES OF IGNATIUS

In the epistles of Ignatius, bishop of Antioch, written about the year 115, references to the Christian ministry are very abundant. Submission to the ministers of the church is indeed his principal theme. It will scarcely be possible to quote all the passages bearing on the subject, but a selection of the most important may be made. We give some more general statements first.

'As touching my fellow-servant Burrhus, who by the will of God is your deacon blessed in all things, I pray that he may remain with me to the honour of yourselves and of your bishop.'[1]

'That being perfectly joined together in one submission, submitting yourselves to your bishop and presbytery, ye may be sanctified in all things.'[2]

'So then it becometh you to run in harmony with the mind of the bishop ; which thing also ye do. For your honourable presbytery, which is worthy of God, is attuned to the bishop, even as its strings to a lyre.'[3]

'I was permitted to see you in the person of Damas your godly bishop and your worthy elders Bassus and Apollonius and my fellow-servant the deacon Sotion, of whom I would fain have joy, for that he is subject to the bishop as unto the grace of God and to the presbytery as unto the law of Jesus Christ.'[4]

'Be ye united with the bishop and with them that preside over you as an ensample and a lesson of incorruptibility.'[5]

[1] Eph. 2. [2] Eph. 2. [3] Eph. 4. [4] Mag. 2. [5] Mag. 6.

'Neither do ye anything without the bishop and the elders.'[1]

'Fare ye well in Jesus Christ, submitting yourselves to the bishop as to the commandment, and likewise also to the presbytery.'[2]

'The churches which are nearest have sent bishops and others, elders and deacons.'[3]

'I salute your godly bishop and your venerable presbytery, and my fellow servants the deacons.'[4]

The above passages are among the more ordinary of those bearing on the subject. They shew, however, the existence of the three orders of ministers, bishops, elders and deacons, beyond dispute, and the emphasis which is laid on submission to them.

An important passage is in the epistle to the Magnesians:

'Be ye zealous to do all things in godly concord, the bishop presiding after the likeness of God, and the elders after the likeness of the council of the apostles, with the deacons also who are most dear to me, having been entrusted with the diaconate of Jesus Christ' (6).

Similar passages appear in the epistle to the Trallians:

'When ye are obedient to the bishop as to Jesus Christ, it is evident to me that ye are living not after men but after Jesus Christ. . . . It is therefore necessary, even as your wont is, that ye should do nothing without the bishop; but be ye obedient also to the presbytery, as to the apostles of Jesus Christ our hope. . . . And those likewise who are deacons of the mysteries of Jesus Christ must please all men in all ways. For they are not deacons of meats and drinks but servants of the church of God' (2).

'In like manner let all men respect the deacons as Jesus Christ, even as they should respect the bishop as being a type of the Father and the elders as the council of God and as the college of apostles. Apart from these there is not even the name of a church ' (3).

---

[1] Mag. 7. [2] Tral. 13. [3] Philad. 10. [4] Smyrn. 12.

Another similar passage is found in the epistle to the Smyrnæans :

' Do ye all follow your bishop, as Jesus Christ followed the Father, and the presbytery as the apostles ; and to the deacons pay respect, as to God's commandment ' (8).

At first sight it is somewhat surprising that it is the elders who are compared with the apostles, not the bishops, as we should expect. That this is in no sense a slip is plain from the fact that the same comparison is given four times. Ignatius shews a certain lack of uniformity in his comparison of the bishop and deacons, but none in that of the elders. The bishop is likened to God, to Jesus Christ and to the Father, the deacons plainly to Jesus Christ on two occasions, and the elders to the apostles four times. Ignatius, however, is comparing the hierarchy of the local church with that of the great church. In the former the ranks are : (1) bishops, (2) elders, and (3) deacons ; in the latter : (1) God the Father, or Jesus Christ, (2) the apostles, and (3) deacons of the great church. Ignatius speaks of ' the apostles as the presbytery of the church '[1] thus agreeing with our identification of the apostles as the primary elders of the great church. Jesus Himself he regards as the typical deacon, having in mind apparently the saying, ' I am in the midst of you as he that serveth ' (Luke xxii. 27), and identifying Him with the true ' deacon of all ' (Mark ix. 35).

A similar threefold hierarchy existed under the old dispensation, as we have seen, in double form, in the great sanhedrin of Jerusalem, and in the local sanhedrins of provincial cities. In the great sanhedrin it was (1) God, (2) chief priests, elders of the people and scribes, and (3) local elders or disciples of the wise ; in the local sanhedrins (1) elders of the great sanhedrin, (2) local elders, and (3) rulers of the synagogue. Ignatius makes mention of two councils, a higher and a lower, which are the Christian equivalents of the higher and lower Jewish courts. With the higher assembly, the council of the great church, in mind he speaks of ‘ the apostles as the presbytery of the church,’ [1] as we have seen; also of ‘ the council of the apostles ’ [2] and ‘ the council of God and the college of apostles.’ [3] Thinking of the lower assembly, the court of the local churches, he writes of ‘ the fitly wreathed spiritual circlet of your presbytery,’ [4] and describes the elders as ‘ the council of the bishop.’ [5] The picture of the circlet is that of the circle of elders in the Jewish synagogue, adapted to the purposes of the Christian church. It appears already in the Apocalypse. ‘ And round about the throne were four and twenty thrones: and upon the thrones I saw four and twenty elders sitting ’ (iv. 4). In the Jewish church the elders of the great sanhedrin are of higher rank and have authority over the elders of the local sanhedrin, and so too in the Christian church the elders of the great church are of higher rank than and have authority over the elders of the local church. The elders of the great church, originally, were the apostles, as Ignatius himself explains, and, if our argument is correct, we may add the rest of the seventy disciples. In the epistles of Ignatius the elders of the great church have been localised, and have become the bishops of the local churches, the successors of ‘ the leaders ’ of Clement.

---

[1] Philad. 5.

In the epistles of Ignatius, as in the *Didache* and the epistle of Clement, the Christian ministry exists largely for the celebration of the eucharist.

‘ If anyone be not within the precinct of the altar, he lacketh the bread (of God). For, if the prayer of one and another hath so great force, how much more that of the bishop and of the whole church.’ [6]

---

[1] Philad. 5.
[2] Mag. 6.
[3] Tral. 3.
[4] Mag. 13.
[5] Philad. 8.
[6] Eph. 5.

'Assemble yourselves together in common . . . to the end that ye may obey the bishop and the presbytery without distraction of mind; breaking one bread, which is the medicine of immortality and the antidote that we should not die but live for ever in Jesus Christ.'[1]

'He that is within the precinct of the altar is clean; but he that is without the precinct of the altar is not clean, that is, he that doeth ought without the bishop and presbytery and deacons, this man is not clean in his conscience.'[2]

'Be ye careful therefore to observe one eucharist (for there is one flesh of our Lord Jesus Christ and one cup unto union in His blood; there is one altar, as there is one bishop, together with the presbytery and the deacons my fellow servants), that whatsoever ye do, ye may do it after God.'[3]

'Let that be held a valid eucharist which is under the bishop or one to whom he shall have committed it. . . . It is not lawful apart from the bishop either to baptize or to hold a lovefeast.'[4]

The bishop is the normal celebrant of the eucharist, but not by himself. He acts with the assistance of the elders and deacons. On occasion another may celebrate in his place, but everything must be done with his authority.

According to Ignatius the three orders of the ministry are universal. He speaks of 'the bishops that are settled in the farthest parts of the earth.'[5] Exhorting the Trallians to respect the bishop, elders and deacons, he says, 'Apart from these there is not even the name of a church' (3). The organisation of the church he ascribes to our Lord and His apostles.

'Do your diligence therefore that ye be confirmed in the ordinances of the Lord and of the apostles, that ye may prosper in all things whatsoever ye do in flesh and spirit . . . with your revered bishop, and with the fitly wreathed spiritual circlet of your presbytery, and with the deacons who walk after God.' [1]

---

[1] Eph. 20.
[2] Tral. 7.
[3] Philad. 4.
[4] Smyrn. 8.
[5] Eph. 3.

'Be ye therefore on your guard against such men. And this will surely be, if ye be not puffed up and if ye be inseparable from Jesus Christ and from the bishop and from the ordinances of the apostles. He that is within the precinct of the altar is clean; but he that is without the precinct of the altar is not clean, that is, he that doeth ought without the bishop and presbytery and deacons, this man is not clean in his conscience. . . . For it becometh you severally, and more especially the elders, to cheer the soul of your bishop unto the honour of the Father of Jesus Christ and of the apostles.' [2]

'If they be at one with the bishop and the elders who are with him, and with the deacons, who have been appointed according to the mind of Jesus Christ.' [3]

There can be little doubt that to Ignatius 'the ordinances of the Lord and of the apostles' included the institution of the threefold ministry, and in particular of episcopacy, with rules for right appointment to each order. Quite likely he was thinking of the *Didache*.

Ignatius speaks of himself to the Romans as 'the bishop from Syria' (2), but he also claims to be a prophet and to give his exhortations on the ministry in the power of the Spirit.

'I cried out, when I was among you; I spake with a loud voice, with God's own voice, Give ye heed to the bishop and the presbytery and deacons. . . . He in whom I am bound is my witness that I learned it not from flesh of man: it was the preaching of the Spirit who spake on this wise; Do nothing without the bishop.' [4]

The organisation of the Christian church was in origin prophetic, in fulfilment of the prophecy of Joel, as St. Peter claimed on the day of Pentecost. 'I will pour forth of my Spirit upon all flesh: and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy' (Acts ii. 17; Joel ii. 28). Those of the highest order of ministers, as Barnabas and Saul, Judas and Silas, were 'prophets,' 'apostles and prophets,' 'prophets and teachers.' In the *Didache*, too, 'prophets' are the chief ministers. Clement of Rome, himself a prophet, writing 'by the Holy Spirit' (63), says that the apostles, 'confirmed in the word of God with full assurance of the Holy Ghost' appointed bishops and deacons, 'when they had proved them by the Spirit' (42). Now Ignatius, writing as a bishop, declares that his teaching, which he gives in almost identical terms to the Philadelphians (7), and to Polycarp (6), is given 'with God's own voice,' and is 'the preaching of the Spirit,' so that he too is a prophet. There is thus continuity through the prophetic Spirit between 'the leaders' of the church of early days and the bishops of later times.

---

[1] Mag. 13. [2] Tral. 7, 12. [3] Philad. *Pro.* [4] Philad. 7.

Certain information with regard to the church of Antioch may be obtained from the letters of Ignatius. He is commonly called bishop of Antioch, and this is doubtless correct, but writing to the Romans, as we have seen, he calls himself 'the bishop from Syria' (2). Writing to the Smyrnæans he says, 'Philo and Rhaius Agathopus, who followed me in the cause of God, ye did well to receive as deacons of God' (10). In the letter to the Philadelphians he speaks of 'Philo the deacon from Cilicia' and 'Rhaius Agathopus, an elect one who followeth me from Syria' (11), so that both alike probably are deacons in the technical sense, and Rhaius Agathopus is a deacon of the church of Syria. There would seem therefore to have been a bishop and deacons at Antioch or in Syria. What of the presbyters?

The references which Ignatius makes to the church of Syria at the conclusion of each of his epistles are interesting.

'Pray for the church which is in Syria.'[1]

'Remember me in your prayers, that I may attain unto God; and remember also the church which is in Syria, whereof I am not worthy to be called a member. For I have need of your united prayer and love in God, that it may be granted to the church which is in Syria to be refreshed by the dew of your fervent supplication.'[1]

---

[1] Eph. 21.

'Remember in your prayers the church which is in Syria.'[2]

'Remember in your prayers the church which is in Syria, which hath God for its shepherd in my stead. Jesus Christ alone shall be its bishop—He and your love.'[3]

'Seeing that in answer to your prayer and to the tender sympathy which ye have in Christ Jesus, it hath been reported to me that the church which is in Antioch of Syria hath peace, it is becoming for you, as a church of God, to appoint a deacon to go thither as God's ambassador, that he may congratulate them when they are assembled together, and may glorify the Name. Blessed in Jesus Christ is he that shall be counted worthy of such a ministration; and ye yourselves shall be glorified.'[4]

'Your prayer sped forth unto the church which is in Antioch of Syria. . . . Therefore that your work may be perfected both on earth and in heaven, it is meet that your church should appoint, for the honour of God, an ambassador of God that he may go as far as Syria and congratulate them because they are at peace, and have recovered their proper magnitude, and their proper constitution hath been restored to them. It seemed to me therefore a fitting thing that ye should send one of your own people with a letter, that he might join with them in giving glory for the calm which by God's will had overtaken them, and because they were already reaching a haven through your prayers.'[5]

'Seeing that the church which is in Antioch of Syria hath peace, as it hath been reported to me, through your prayers, I myself also have been the more comforted. . . . It becometh thee, most blessed Polycarp, to call together a godly council and to elect some one among you who is very dear to you and zealous also, who shall be fit to bear the name of God's courier—to appoint him, I say, that he may go to Syria and glorify your zealous love unto the glory of God. . . . I salute him that shall be appointed to go to Syria.'[1]

---

[1] Mag. 14.
[2] Tral. 13.
[3] Rom. 9.
[4] Philad. 10.
[5] Smyrn. 11.

The epistles to the Ephesians, the Magnesians, the Trallians and the Romans were written from Smyrna before Ignatius had received news from Antioch; those to the Philadelphians, the Smyrnæans and Polycarp from Troas after he had heard that the church in Syria had peace. It is noticeable that in each of the former he speaks of 'the church which is in Syria' and in each of the latter of 'the church which is in Antioch of Syria.' The explanation presumably is that in the first instance the church of Antioch was no longer in existence but its members were scattered throughout Syria, just as the church of Jerusalem in earlier days had been scattered throughout Judæa and Samaria (Acts viii. 1), but that afterwards when the persecution ceased there was a return to Antioch.

Ignatius's description of their new condition is that they 'have recovered their proper magnitude, and their proper constitution hath been restored to them.' What exactly is the significance of these words? It is remarkable in view of his emphasis elsewhere on the need of a right attitude towards bishop, elders and deacons, that here Ignatius mentions none of them. It is somewhat astonishing, as he is so insistent in his requests for prayer for himself and the church in Syria, that he asks for no prayer that a worthy successor to himself may be appointed as bishop of Antioch, when the vacancy which, though it had not yet actually occurred, was at any rate imminent, actually takes place. Certainly it would seem there is no successor in view and no one has been nominated, for although he is very anxious that messengers should be sent with congratulations on the restoration of peace, nothing is said of any congratulations of a bishop designate. He writes to Polycarp, ‘ I salute him that shall be appointed to go to Syria,’ but he sends neither salutation nor good wishes to a possible successor. It is plain that though it could be said that the church of Antioch had recovered its ‘ proper magnitude ’ and that its ‘ proper constitution ’ had been restored, it still lacked the presence of a head.

---

[1] Poly. 7, 8.

We note the emphasis which Ignatius places on the word ‘ proper,’ its ‘ proper magnitude,’ its ‘ proper constitution.’ That the church of Antioch has recovered its ‘ proper magnitude ’ probably means that it is no longer a remnant, that its members have returned to the city in full force, and that it has regained its own peculiar importance. That its ‘ proper constitution,’ or ‘ corporation,’ has been restored means that now again it has its own proper corporate existence, the church is again functioning as a body according to its own particular mode of being. Does Ignatius mean by his emphasis on the word ‘ proper ’ that the ‘ constitution,’ or ‘ corporation,’ of the church of Antioch was different from that of, say, Ephesus, or other churches ? This at any rate would appear to have been the case in New Testament times according to what we read in Acts. ‘ Now there were at Antioch, in the church that was there, prophets and teachers ’ (xiii. 1). These prophets and teachers were not only elders of the church of Antioch but elders of the great church, so we decided, and the church of Antioch, like the church of Jerusalem, was a metropolitical church. Had this condition of things ceased to exist in the time of Ignatius ? If Antioch was the centre of a college of elders of the great church, not yet localised as diocesan bishops as in Asia, the significance of the statement that its ‘ proper constitution ’ had been restored would be plain, for when the elders were gathered together again as a body the absence of the bishop, who in such a case would be simply the presiding elder, would not seriously mar the functional completeness of the church. The appointment of a bishop would be merely the selection of a permanent president. If this was the position of Ignatius at Antioch, though his authority over the elders would be less than that of a bishop over local elders, relative to the church at large his office would be much higher than that of an ordinary bishop. So we could explain much in the life of Ignatius which otherwise would seem very extraordinary.

The interest taken in the journey of Ignatius to Rome is very remarkable. Though he went as a prisoner in bonds, it was really a triumphal progress. To the Romans he writes, 'My spirit saluteth you, and the love of the churches which received me in the name of Jesus Christ, not as a mere wayfarer: for even those churches which did not lie on my route after the flesh went before me from city to city' (9). In the letters which are extant we find that the Ephesians, the Magnesians, the Trallians and the Philadelphians sent their bishops, and certain of them elders and deacons as well. He writes to the churches as one who has a right to command. He requests the Philadelphians and Smyrnæans to send messengers to congratulate the church of Antioch as one who cannot be gainsaid. 'It is becoming for you, as a church of God, to appoint a deacon to go thither as God's ambassador'[1]; 'It is meet that your church should appoint, for the honour of God, an ambassador of God that he may go as far as Syria. . . . It seemed to me therefore a fitting thing that ye should send one of your own people with a letter.'[2] He will brook no refusal. 'Now if ye desire it, it is not impossible for you to do this for the name of God'[3]; 'If ye desire to do well, God is ready to grant the means.'[4] He gives his orders to Polycarp, bishop of

---

[1] Philad. 10. [2] Smyrn. 11. [3] Philad. 10. [4] Smyrn. 11.

Smyrna, in the same tone of unquestionable superiority. 'It becometh thee, most blessed Polycarp, to call together a godly council and to elect some one among you who is very dear to you and zealous also, who shall be fit to bear the name of God's courier—to appoint him, I say, that he may go to Syria' (7). He requires unhesitating obedience. 'I trust in the Divine grace, that ye are ready for an act of well-doing which is meet for God' (7). Ignatius makes frequent expressions of humility, but he certainly has a very complete sense of his own importance. And this attitude was not only acquiesced in but even welcomed by Polycarp and other bishops and churches. The very existence of his letters is evidence of this. What is the explanation? Ignatius was a confessor for the faith, expecting to be a martyr, and confessors and martyrs were held in the highest estimation. The veneration shewn to confessors and martyrs, however, was a different thing from the unquestioning obedience required by Ignatius. There is no suggestion that he bases his authority on any such ground. No reason is given; it is quietly assumed. It could only be because Ignatius was a very important person in the Christian world, superior to Polycarp and to the other bishops of Asia. We cannot doubt that he was not merely the head of a body of local elders but president of a college of elders of the great church, of bishops, to give the equivalent title. He was the chief minister of a metropolitical church, what in later days was called the patriarch of Antioch.

Asia had been evangelized from Antioch, and in early days the churches of Asia were naturally subject to the leaders from Antioch, as Paul, Barnabas and Silas. The settlement of the apostle John in Ephesus, and the localisation of elders of the great church as diocesan bishops in the local churches had altered this arrangement, at any rate in some parts of Asia. St. John, however, left no successor at Ephesus, and so after his death the bishops and churches of Asia would naturally acknowledge the primacy of Antioch. Strictly localised jurisdiction probably existed nowhere, and churches which never received a bishop of their own were perhaps never entirely separated from dependence on Antioch. The primacy of the bishop of the metropolitical church of Antioch would thus be admitted throughout Asia and probably beyond, at any rate where, as in Greece, diocesan bishops did not exist. So we can understand the extraordinary interest in Ignatius shewn by all the churches of Asia and the authority which he claimed over them. It would explain too why Burrhus, the deacon of Ephesus, was content to accompany him, and Philo the deacon followed him from Cilicia, a church with which Ignatius had otherwise no very obvious connexion, as well as Rhaius Agathopus from Syria, not, we notice, from Antioch.

It is somewhat remarkable that in his epistle to the Romans Ignatius makes no mention of bishops, elders or deacons. Much of the letter is taken up with praise of the Roman church, and the rest with a plea that they will do nothing to deprive him of martyrdom. It would, doubtless, have been incongruous in a letter to his ideal church to exhort them to submission to bishop, elders and deacons, the burden of most of his epistles to the churches of Asia, but we might have expected on the assumption that the ideal relationship between the church and its ministers actually existed some mention of the fact. Yet there is no reference to the ministry. It cannot be supposed that no officers corresponding to any of the three orders existed in the church of Rome, for the epistle of Clement leaves no room for doubt. He writes to the Romans, 'Ye were the instructors of others. And my desire is that those lessons shall hold good which as teachers ye enjoin' (3). The words must include a reference to the epistle of Clement, and there is other evidence that Ignatius was familiar with it. Clement's discussion of the ministry could not have been unknown to him. It is therefore all the more surprising that he says nothing about the ideal relationship of a church to its bishop, elders and deacons.

There is however a remarkable statement in the salutation at the beginning of the epistle. 'To the church . . . that hath the presidency in the country of the region of the Romans . . . having the presidency of love.' We notice that it is the church which is said to preside, not the bishop. We are reminded of the statement of Josephus with regard to the city of Jerusalem. 'Jerusalem, as the royal city, rules [over Judæa], presiding over all the neighbouring country as the head over the body.' [1] In the case of Jerusalem it meant that the elders of Jerusalem, of the sanhedrin of the Jerusalemites, had authority over all other elders and sanhedrins of Judæa, and indeed in certain matters far beyond. The same was true, as we have seen, of the elders of the Christian church of Jerusalem, the great church. The meaning intended by Ignatius must be very similar. The letter of Clement makes it plain that bishops and deacons must have existed in Rome as well as in Corinth or his whole argument would be nugatory. 'So preaching everywhere in country and town, [the apostles] appointed their firstfruits, when they had proved them by the Spirit, to be bishops and deacons unto them that should believe' (42). Usually bishops or elders of a local church were distinct from elders of the great church who are called 'leaders,' 'men on the roll,' but it was not so everywhere, as we have seen, not at Jerusalem, apparently not at Antioch, while this passage confirms the view already suggested by other evidence that it was not so at Rome. It would seem that the churches which afterwards became patriarchal were from the earliest days metropolitical in a sense similar to that in which in civil matters Jerusalem was the metropolis of Judæa and Antioch the metropolis of Syria.

---

[1] *Wars,* III. iii. 5.

The word translated 'preside' is that commonly used at the period of the relationship of metropolitical cities to their regions. We read of 'Antioch the metropolis, holy and inviolate and autonomous, both ruling over and having the presidency over the east.'[1] We read too of 'Mycenæ having the presidency over Argos,'[2] and of Celænæ 'having the presidency over Phrygia and Lydia'[3]; also later of 'Byzantium, the city which has the presidency over the east.'[4] The church of Rome likewise, Ignatius says, has 'the presidency in the country of the region of the Romans.' In this district all her elders have authority as bishops, just as the elders of Jerusalem and Antioch within their jurisdiction. This, as we have seen, was the reason for the interference of the church of Rome in the affairs of the church of Corinth as shewn in the letter of Clement.

---

[1] Joann. Malal. *Chron.* ix.

[2] Schol. to Soph. *Electr.* 234.

[3] Dion Chrysost. *Or.* xxxv.

[4] Greg. Naz. *Or.* xliii. 14.

CHAPTER VI

POLYCARP

THE epistle of Polycarp to the Philippians (115–25) affords confirmation of our conclusions with regard to the Christian ministry elsewhere. Ignatius addressed him as ‘ Polycarp who is bishop of the church of the Smyrnæans ’ in the epistle sent to him, and bade him, ‘ Vindicate thine office in all diligence of flesh and of spirit ’ (1). Later in the epistle, when giving exhortations for the church of Smyrna, he says, ‘ Give ye heed to the bishop, that God also may give heed to you. I am devoted to those who are subject to the bishop, the elders, the deacons ’ (6). Similar advice is given at greater length in the epistle Ignatius addressed to the Smyrnæans themselves. ‘ Do ye all follow your bishop, as Jesus Christ followed the Father, and the presbytery as the apostles ; and to the deacons pay respect, as to God’s commandment. Let no man do aught of things pertaining to the church apart from the bishop. Let that be held a valid eucharist which is under the bishop or one to whom he shall have committed it. Wheresoever the bishop shall appear, there let the people be ; even as where Jesus may be, there is the catholic church. It is not lawful apart from the bishop either to baptize or to hold a love-feast ; but whatsoever he shall approve, this is well-pleasing also to God ; that everything which ye do may be sure and valid ’ (8).

The opening words of the epistle of Polycarp are in agreement with the evidence afforded by Ignatius, though he does not actually call himself a bishop. 'Polycarp and the elders that are with him unto the church of God which sojourneth at Philippi.' There is no need to contradict the statement of Ignatius, and to suppose that Polycarp and the elders that were with him were elders in the same sense. Certainly there is no evidence that the church of Smyrna was metropolitical. We may take it then that Polycarp's salutation must be understood as implying the same orders of ministers at Smyrna as Ignatius supposes, a bishop, elders and deacons, though these last are not named.

When, however, Polycarp speaks of the church of Philippi we notice a difference. 'Wherefore it is right to abstain from all these things, submitting yourselves to the elders and deacons as to God and Christ' (5). We notice that Polycarp repeats with an addition the words of St. Peter, which are quoted also by Clement of Rome (57), 'Submit yourselves to the elders' (I. Pet. v. 5). Polycarp differs verbally from Ignatius, who compares the bishop, not the elders, to Jesus Christ or God, 'When ye are obedient to the bishop as to Jesus Christ.'[1] There is no fundamental difference, however, for to Ignatius all authority is of God and submission to the bishop is only a particular example of a general principle. He says: 'For everyone whom the Master of the household sendeth to be steward over His own house, we ought so to receive as Him that sent him. Plainly therefore we ought to regard the bishop as the Lord Himself.'[2] The important point is not that the elders and deacons are to be obeyed as God and Christ, but that there is no mention of a bishop at all. This fact cannot be explained by supposing that the bishop of Philippi was absent at the time, or even that the bishopric was vacant. We can only conclude that as yet there was no bishop of Philippi.

Evidently the same conditions continued to exist in certain churches of Europe, if not of Asia, as existed in the period immediately after their evangelization by Paul and Silas. Doubtless they always appointed elders in every church (Acts xiv. 23 ; cf. Titus i. 5), but higher officers, apostles, prophets or teachers, 'the leaders,' would usually be far away, and at best could make only occasional visits. It was for this purpose in particular that Paul and Silas set out on the second missionary journey from Antioch (Acts xv. 36–41). That they might perform such higher ministries St. Paul left Timothy in Ephesus and Titus in Crete. The presence of Clement and others at Philippi, when St. Paul wrote his epistle to the church, we have seen reason to explain in a similar way.[1] Possibly the tours of the brethren of the Lord (I. Cor. ix. 5), certain from James (Gal. ii. 12) and others (Gal. iii. 1) had the same object. In certain places the condition of things described in the *Didache* still existed apparently in the days of Ignatius and Polycarp. As no limits of jurisdiction were determined there would be a certain amount of overlapping, the same church being visited by more than one prophet or elder, as we find in the New Testament and the *Didache*. In the Jewish church congregations were dependent on occasional visits from elders of the great sanhedrin, or rabbis, and a similar practice continued for a long period in certain Christian churches. So, it would seem, we must explain the absence of any mention of a bishop at Philippi in the epistle of Polycarp.

---

[1] Tral. 2.

[2] Eph. 6.

The church of Philippi was still in the same position with regard to its leaders, apparently, as it was after the departure of Paul and Silas when Clement and others paid their visits. There were still bishops, who were local elders, and deacons, as when St. Paul wrote his epistle, but in contradistinction to many at any rate of the churches in Asia there was no resident diocesan bishop. For the higher ministrations the church still had to depend upon itinerant leaders and utilise the services of any bishop, in the higher sense, available.

---

[1] See pp. 127–130, 173.

Consequently, it would seem, they wrote to Polycarp asking for words of exhortation, when Ignatius and his companions had passed through Philippi on the way to Rome, or perhaps later. Polycarp says: 'These things, brethren, I write unto you concerning righteousness, not because I laid this charge upon myself, but because ye invited me. For neither am I, nor is any other like unto me, able to follow the wisdom of the blessed and glorious Paul' (3). Irenæus tells us that Polycarp wrote for the benefit not simply of one but of many churches.[1] The words, 'neither I nor any other like unto me,' help to confirm our view that the Philippians were dependent upon the occasional ministrations of any leaders who might be had.

The condition of things at Philippi was evidently much the same as at Corinth when Clement wrote. Then the leaders, or men on the roll, were somewhat removed from the ordinary life of the church. Clement's letter rather suggests that Corinth was normally administered from Rome, for he claims both responsibility and authority in the matter of the dissension, though scarcely to the exclusion of all higher ministrations and supervision from elsewhere. If it was true of Corinth that it was 'in the country of the region of the Romans,' the same was probably true of Philippi. Rome, however, was a long way off, and so we can understand that the Philippians, who wrote to Polycarp at the request of Ignatius to ask that his letter and theirs might be sent into Syria, and to ask also for copies of other letters of Ignatius, would invite the renowned bishop of Smyrna for some words of consolation of his own.

Among his exhortations Polycarp gives advice to both deacons and elders:

'In like manner deacons should be blameless in the presence of His righteousness, as deacons of God and Christ and not of men; not calumniators, not double tongued, not lovers of money, temperate in all things, compassionate, diligent, walking according to the truth of the Lord who became a deacon of all' (5).

---

[1] *Ad Flor.*; Eus. *Ecc. Hist.* v. xx. 8.

'And the elders also must be compassionate, merciful towards all men, turning back the sheep that are gone astray, visiting all the infirm, not neglecting a widow or an orphan or a poor man: but providing always for that which is honourable in the sight of God and of men, abstaining from all anger, respect of persons, unrighteous judgment, being far from all love of money, not quick to believe anything against any man, not hasty in judgment, knowing that we all are debtors of sin' (6).

The influence of the Pastoral Epistles is obvious in both exhortations. The designation 'deacons of God and Christ' is clearly not independent of Polycarp's version of the admonition of St. Peter, repeated by both Clement and Ignatius, 'submitting yourselves to the elders and deacons as to God and Christ,' which follows, or of the similar designation (probably corrupt) which appears in the epistle of Ignatius to the Smyrnæans 'deacons of Christ God' (10). The words of St. Mark, 'deacon of all' (ix. 35), are applied to Jesus, an identification which seems to have suggested the statement of Ignatius in the epistle to the Magnesians that the deacons are 'entrusted with the diaconate of Jesus Christ' (6).

Another passage of the epistle of Polycarp, which brings out the local character of the office of elder, may be quoted: 'I was exceedingly grieved for Valens, who aforetime was an elder among you, because he is so ignorant of the office which was given unto him' (11). Nothing, unfortunately, is said of the person by whom the office was given to him.

In the letter of the Smyrnæans on the martyrdom of Polycarp (†156) there are a few points of interest for the early history of the ministry. We read: 'In the number of these [the elect] was this man, the glorious martyr Polycarp, who was found an apostolic and prophetic teacher in our own time, a bishop of the catholic church which is in Smyrna ' (16). The threefold description ' an apostolic and prophetic teacher ' is particularly notable. We remember ' the prophets and teachers ' who were at Antioch, and in particular Barnabas and Saul who, when they had received their commission, became ' apostles ' (Acts xiii. 1, xiv. 4, 14). ' The apostles and prophets ' (Eph. ii. 20, iii. 5 ; Rev. xviii. 20) is a common New Testament description of ministers of the highest rank. In the *Didache* the chief officers of the church are ' apostles and prophets ' and ' prophets and teachers ' (xi. 2, xv. 1, 2). The description of Polycarp as ' an apostolic and prophetic teacher ' is thus in agreement with the earliest Christian terminology with regard to the chief ministers of the Christian society.

Polycarp is also ' bishop of the catholic church which is in Smyrna.' The salutation of the epistle begins, ' The church of God which sojourneth at Smyrna to the church of God which sojourneth in Philomelium and to all the brotherhoods of the holy and catholic church sojourning in every place.' There is another reading, ' holy church,' in the description of Polycarp, but whichever be correct, the contrast in view would seem to be between the local church and the great church. He is not so much ' bishop of the church of Smyrna ' as ' bishop of the holy catholic church sojourning in Smyrna.' He is called ' bishop of the church of the Smyrnæans ' by Ignatius in the salutation of his epistle to Polycarp, and this is in accordance with later practice, but in earlier days this would have been understood as meaning that he was a local elder or bishop. He was a bishop or elder of the great church settled at Smyrna with his jurisdiction localised in that district. He is clearly not regarded as bishop of the church of the city of Smyrna only, but of the whole neighbourhood over a wide area.

At his martyrdom we are told that the multitude of both Gentiles and Jews called out, ‘ This is the teacher of Asia, the father of the Christians ’ (12). This seems to imply that not every city or town even in Asia had as yet a bishop of its own. He was presumably the only ‘ apostolic and prophetic teacher ’ for a large portion of Asia, the only ‘ bishop of the holy and catholic church ’ as distinct from local bishops, or local elders. The fact that even in Asia there were towns without resident diocesan bishops helps us to understand the position of Philippi and explains the request of that church that Polycarp would write to them a pastoral letter.

CHAPTER VII

IRENÆUS

Our inquiry may well close with the evidence to be found in the works of Irenæus (*c.* 185). Many times he appeals to the authority of information derived from those he calls 'the elders.' In each case presumably he is referring to what he found in the writings of Papias, who as we have seen based his work on traditions he tells us he had received from 'the elders.' In one instance Irenæus is quite explicit on the point, and there seems no reason to suppose a different source in other places. 'As the elders who had seen John the disciple of the Lord remembered that they had heard of him. . . . And these things Papias also, who was a hearer of John and companion of Polycarp, an ancient man, testified in writing in the fourth of his books: for there are five books compiled by him.'[1] Sometimes he speaks of them simply as 'the elders': 'The elders used to declare'[2]; 'As the elders say'[3]; 'The elders say that so it will be.'[4] In other places he describes them as 'disciples of the apostles': 'Wherefore also the elders, the disciples of the apostles, say'[5]; 'We are told by the elders, the disciples of the apostles'[6]; 'Even as the elders, the disciples of the apostles, have handed down to us.'[7] Sometimes a longer description is given, 'As the gospel and all the elders witness, who in Asia conferred with John, the disciple of the Lord '[1]; ' As the elders who had seen John the disciple of the Lord remembered that they had heard of him.'[2]

---

[1] *Adv. Haer.* v. xxxiii. 3–4.
[2] iv. xxviii. 1.
[3] v. xxxvi. 1.
[4] *Apostolic Preaching*, § 61.
[5] v. v. 1.
[6] v. xxxvi. 2.
[7] *Apostolic Preaching*, § 3.

Irenæus's references to ' the elders ' are in exact agreement with what he says also of Polycarp. He speaks of him as ' the blessed and apostolic elder,' and includes him among the elders whom he regards as authorities for tradition. ' These doctrines the elders which were before us, who were disciples too of the apostles, delivered not unto thee. For I saw thee, when I was yet a child, in lower Asia with Polycarp. . . . I can even tell the place where the blessed Polycarp used to sit and converse . . . and the discourses that he used to make to the people, and his intercourse with John how he would tell of it, and that with the rest of those who had seen the Lord, and how he would recount their words; and concerning the Lord what things they were which he had heard from them both as to His mighty works and His teaching, as Polycarp having received them from the eye-witnesses of the life of the Word, used to recount them consonantly to the Scriptures.'[3] Elsewhere, too, he speaks of Polycarp as an authority for tradition. ' And Polycarp, too, who had not only been trained by the apostles, and had conversed with many of those who had seen Christ, but also had been constituted by the apostles, bishop over Asia, in the church of Smyrna . . . having always taught these things, which he learned from the apostles.'[4] He appeals also to the practice of Polycarp, ' For neither could Anicetus persuade Polycarp not to keep, in that with John the disciple of our Lord and the rest of the apostles with whom he lived, he had ever kept it.'[5]

Irenæus does not really distinguish the elder Polycarp from the elders of whom he had read in Papias's work, or his traditions from theirs, yet Polycarp is an elder simply because he is an elder or bishop of the church. Writing to Florinus, Irenæus speaks of 'the elders before us' among whom he includes Polycarp, and writing to Victor, bishop of Rome, of 'the elders before Soter,' 'the elders before you (Victor),' 'the elders before him (Anicetus).' The meaning must be the same in each case, and the reference can only be to elders of the great church, or bishops. Irenæus makes this quite plain. 'And the elders before Soter, who were over the church which you now rule, Anicetus, I mean, and Pius and Hyginus, and Telesphorus and Sixtus, did neither themselves observe nor committed to their successors.'[1] The elders of Papias and Irenæus were elders, as we have seen, such as St. John appointed over various churches in Asia, those who are called 'the angels of the churches' by John the prophet (Rev. i. 20), and 'bishops' by Ignatius. Polycarp indeed being called 'bishop' by Ignatius, and both 'elder' and 'bishop' by Irenæus.

---

[1] II. xxii. 5.

[2] V. xxxiii. 3.

[3] *Ad Flor.*

[4] III. iii. 4.

[5] *Ad Vict.*; Eusebius, *Ecc. Hist.* v. xxiv. 16.

Irenæus, however, not only tells us of the past, but gives us considerable information about the organisation of the church in his own day. With it it will be useful to combine other facts told us by Eusebius. Irenæus wrote all his works apparently while bishop of Lyons in Gaul. His predecessor was Pothinus. The letter of the churches of Lyons and Vienne to the churches of Asia and Phrygia speaks of him as 'the blessed Pothinus, to whom had been committed the ministry of the episcopate at Lyons.'[2] Eusebius tells us, 'Irenæus succeeded to the episcopate of the community at Lyons of which Pothinus was the leader.'[3] In the letter of the martyrs of Gaul to Eleutherus, bishop of Rome, we read, 'This letter we have charged our brother and companion Irenæus to convey to thee. . . . If we knew that place ever brought a man righteousness, we would have commended him first and foremost as an elder of the church, which office indeed he holds.'[4] Eusebius, paraphrasing this, speaks of Irenæus as, 'already at that time an elder of the community at Lyons[1]; yet the letter says 'an elder of the church,' which, particularly as the letter was written not in the name of the martyrs of Lyons only, but of Lyons and Vienne, suggests not an elder of the local church of Lyons, but an elder of the great church, that is, that he was already, as we might say, in bishop's orders. Though Eusebius tells us that Irenæus succeeded to the episcopate of the community at Lyons, nothing is said of his consecration, which presumably had already taken place.

---

[1] *Ad Vict.* [2] v. i. 29. [3] v. v. 8. [4] v. iv. 2.

Irenæus had spent some time in Rome in his earlier days, and is said to have taught there. He had the highest veneration for the church of Rome. 'There is one church, very great, and most ancient and known to all, the church founded and established at Rome by two most glorious apostles, Peter and Paul, whose tradition which it hath from the apostles, and her faith proclaimed unto men by succession of bishops coming down even unto us, we point to.'[2] As bishop of Lyons he writes, 'We are able to recount those whom the apostles appointed to be bishops in the churches and their successors, even to us.'[3] Whence did he count his own succession? For him the succession of office is the succession of tradition. After giving the succession of the bishops of Rome, he continues, 'By the same order, and in the same succession, both the tradition from the apostles in the church, and the preaching of the truth, have come down to us.'[4] The Roman succession of bishops and the Roman tradition of the faith have both alike 'come down to us.' Though he proceeds to give an account of what he had learned from Polycarp, he says nothing comparable with this: 'He tarried with us long . . . having always taught these things, which he learned from the apostles, which the church delivers, which alone are true. These things are witnessed by all the churches in Asia, and by those who down to the present time have succeeded Polycarp.'[1] The personal note is absent. We have no longer ' down to us,' which is repeated three times in talking of the church of Rome, but only ' down to the present time.'

---

[1] v. iv. 1. [2] III. iii. 2. [3] *Adv. Haer.* III. iii. 1. [4] III. iii. 3.

There can be little doubt that Irenæus traces his succession as a bishop as well as the tradition of faith, which he sets out at such length, to the church of Rome. This would explain the fact that his interest in the Roman church is sustained. He wrote letters to Victor bishop of Rome, and to Florinus an elder of the church of Rome. As a mere outsider, only a provincial bishop of Gaul, this would be rather an impertinence, but as technically an elder of the Roman church, one who had derived his orders from Rome, his position would be strong. He wrote to Florinus while the latter was still an elder of the church of Rome, ' These doctrines the elders before us, who were disciples too of the apostles, delivered not unto thee.'[2] ' The elders before us ' were doubtless the elders, including Polycarp, who had been disciples of John in Asia, but the point is that Irenæus as bishop of Lyons claimed that both he and Florinus were elders in the same sense, and in the sense in which Polycarp was an elder. We remember that Irenæus uses the same method of describing the elders before Anicetus, Soter and Victor. He does not distinguish the eldership of himself, Florinus, Anicetus, Soter, Victor and Polycarp. All were elders of the great church, and therefore from the point of view of order, bishops, though not all diocesan bishops.

All this fits in with our conclusion that the church of Rome was a metropolitical church. A metropolitical church, we have seen, is one which possesses higher dignity and authority than ordinary churches, and within its own region exercises jurisdiction over such, as the great sanhedrin of Jerusalem over local sanhedrins among the Jews. Such a higher authority, or sovereignty, Irenæus definitely claims for the church of Rome, 'With this church on account of its higher sovereignty the whole church . . . must needs agree.' [1] We compare Ignatius's similar description of the church of Rome, 'The church . . . that hath the presidency in the country of the region of the Romans . . . having the presidency of love.' [2]

---

[1] III. iii. 4.

[2] *Ad Flor.*

The church in Gaul was a missionary church, yet ruled, it would seem, by elders of the church of Rome. Eusebius speaks of 'the communities in Gaul over which Irenæus was bishop,' [3] and probably Irenæus was the only bishop in the higher sense, though doubtless there were other elders of the great church in Gaul, holding a position like that of Irenæus before the death of Pothinus. Apparently there were in Gaul, as in Rome, no local elders, that is, no elders of an inferior grade to be distinguished from elders of the great church. At any rate we hear of none, and Irenæus, it would seem, knew of none.

The idea of the ministry of the church as it obtained at Rome being alone in the mind of Irenæus when he wrote had a curious effect on his interpretation of the account of St. Paul's charge to the elders of Ephesus, whom he addresses as bishops. 'In Miletus, having called together the bishops and elders which were of Ephesus, and of the other towns in the neighbourhood . . . he added . . . Take heed therefore to yourselves and to the whole flock, wherein the Holy Ghost hath set you over them as bishops, to rule the church of the Lord which he formed to himself by his own blood.' [4] Not grasping the fact that in the New Testament elders and bishops are synonymous terms, and thinking, at any rate for the moment, that as at Rome the bishop was the presiding or ruling elder in the local church he introduces a reference to bishops in his version of St. Paul's invitation, and as this was necessarily in the plural because of the reference to bishops in St. Paul's speech he adds also the mention of 'the other towns in the neighbourhood' to account for it, as there is but one bishop in one church.

---

[1] III. iii. 2. [2] Rom. *Pro.* [3] V. xxiii. 3. [4] III. xiv. 2.

Yet although we hear of no local elders in the churches of Gaul, there were certainly deacons. The letter of the churches of Lyons to Vienne speaks of 'Sanctus, the deacon from Vienne.'[1] Irenæus tells us also that the heretic Mark had seduced the wife of 'a certain deacon from among ours in Asia,'[2] which implies the existence of deacons in Gaul as well as in Asia. Irenæus has no doubt that the seven spoken of in Acts were deacons in the same sense. He says: 'The Nicolaitans have for their master Nicolas, one of the seven who were first ordained to the diaconate by the apostles.'[3] 'There is Stephen too, again, who was chosen by the apostles first deacon.'[4] 'And Luke too wrote concerning Stephen, who was first elected by the apostles to the diaconate.'[5]

A study of the chief passages in Irenæus bearing on the subject of the ministry of the church is most interesting and important. The description of the succession in the church of Rome is particularly valuable. 'The tradition therefore of the apostles, made manifest in all the world, all may look back upon, who wish to see things truly; and we are able to recount those whom the apostles appointed to be bishops in the churches, and their successors, even down to us. . . . Yet surely, if the apostles had known any hidden mysteries . . . they would deliver it to those, even more than others, to whom they were entrusting the churches themselves. For very perfect and blameless in all things would they have them to be, whom they were leaving to be their actual successors, committing to them their own place of presidency. . . . But because it were very long in such a work as this to reckon up the successions in all the churches, there is one, very great, and most ancient and known to all, the church founded and established at Rome by two most glorious apostles, Peter and Paul, whose tradition which it hath from the apostles, and her faith proclaimed unto men by succession of bishops coming down even unto us, we point to. . . . For with this church on account of its higher sovereignty the whole church (I mean the faithful of all countries) must needs agree. . . . The blessed apostles, then, having founded and builded the church, committed the ministry of the episcopate to Linus. . . . And his successor is Anencletus : and after him in the third place from the apostles the bishopric is allotted to Clement, who had both seen the blessed apostles, and conferred with them, and had the doctrine of the apostles yet sounding in his ears, and their tradition before his eyes. . . . This Clement again Evarestus succeeds, and Evarestus, Alexander : then Sixtus in like manner is appointed, sixth from the apostles : and after him Telesphorus, who was also a glorious martyr ; afterwards Hyginus, then Pius, and after him Anicetus. Anicetus having been succeeded by Soter, the bishop's office is now held, in the twelfth place from the apostles, by Eleutherus. By the same order, and in the same succession, both the tradition from the apostles in the church, and the preaching of the truth, have come down to us.' [1] We notice that the bishops are those to whom the apostles entrusted the churches.

---

[1] Eusebius, *Ecc. Hist.* v. i. 17.
[2] *Adv. Haer.* I. xiii. 5.
[3] I. xxvi. 3.
[4] III. xii. 10.
[5] IV. xv. 1.

The succession of bishops is to Irenæus of supreme importance, and he makes repeated reference to it. 'True gnosis is the teaching of the apostles, and the original system of the church in the whole world, and the mark of Christ's body in the several successions of the bishops, to whom they committed that church, which is in each several place.' [2] The definition of a bishop as one to whom the apostles committed the church is repeated. Again we read : 'Wherefore we

[1] III. iii. 1–3.

[2] IV. xxxiii. 8.

should hearken to those elders who are in the church; those who have their succession from the apostles, as we have pointed out; who with their succession in the episcopate received a sure gift of the truth, at the good pleasure of the Father. . . . Of such elders the church is the nurse; of whom also a prophet saith, I will give thy princes in peace, and thy bishops in righteousness (Is. lx. 17).'[1] 'When on the other hand we challenge them to that tradition which is of the apostles, which is guarded by the successions of elders in the churches, they oppose tradition, saying that themselves, being wiser not only than elders, but even than apostles, have discovered the genuine truth.'[2] The succession is of bishops, of elders in the episcopate, and of elders. In view of his repeated definition of the work of a bishop, as one to whom the local church is committed, it is clear that to him a bishop, though not a minister of a different order, bishops and elders being from one point of view synonymous terms, is the presiding or ruling elder, and that in his circle there are really only two distinct orders of ministers, the difference between bishop and elder being similar to that between diocesan bishop and bishop in our day, or at a lower level between rector or vicar and priest. No ordination or consecration of a bishop was necessary, for elders of the church of Rome are already elders of the great church and, from the point of view of order, bishops.

So we understand the language used to describe the Roman succession. The bishopric is 'allotted' to Clement, the 'lot' of the episcopate is held by Eleutherus. The words suggest the action of the apostles in the appointment of Matthias, who was selected, not ordained: 'The lot fell upon Matthias; and he was numbered with the eleven apostles' (Acts i. 26). The same thought lies behind Irenæus's conception of succession which is of office not of ordination; this, if our contention is correct, had already taken place. His view of the ministry is that of the church of Rome, a metropolitical church in which the elders are elders of the great church, from the point of view of order already bishops, in which, though there is a threefold office, there is only a twofold order of ministers.

---

[1] IV. xxvi. 2, 5.

[2] III. ii. 2.

It is interesting to notice that Irenæus uses the title 'metropolis' of the church of Jerusalem. After quoting the prayer of the church on the loosing of Peter and John, he continues: 'These are the voices of that church, from which the whole church had its beginning: these are the words of the metropolis, of the citizens of the new covenant: these are the voices of the apostles: these are the voices of the disciples of the Lord, of the truly perfect, made such by the Spirit after the assumption of the Lord.'[1]

[1] III. xii. 5.

CHAPTER VIII

METROPOLITICAL CHURCHES

ALONG several paths our argument has led us to the conclusion that in the earliest days the churches of certain cities were metropolitical and exercised authority over other subordinate churches, just as under the old covenant Jerusalem was the metropolis of Judæa, as Josephus makes plain[1], and beyond. In such churches the elders belonged to the highest order of ministers in the church, and in later times would have been called bishops in the higher meaning of the title. This result we shall find throws light on several difficulties in the early history of the church and ministry.

I.—ROME

What exactly was the position of Hippolytus in the hierarchy of the church ? It is a question which has been asked from very early days. Of what see, if any, was he bishop ? Eusebius, after speaking of Beryllus, bishop of the Arabians at Bostra, continues : 'And likewise also Hippolytus, who also presided over another church somewhere.'[2] Jerome likewise confesses his ignorance : 'Hippolytus, bishop of some church, the name of the city indeed I have not been able to discover.'[3] The earliest information about him is to be found in the Liberian catalogue of bishops, where we read, 'At that time Pontianus the bishop, and Hippolytus the elder were deported as exiles to Sardinia.'[4] This notice, we are told, probably dates from about the year 255. The evidence seems clear that he was not a bishop in the same sense as Pontianus, being described merely as an elder. Later, pope Damasus speaks of him as 'Hippolytus the elder,'[1] and Prudentius uses the same designation.[2] Of himself Hippolytus says: 'No other will refute these errors save the Holy Ghost given in the church, which the apostles first received and then imparted to right believers; and forasmuch as we are their successors, sharing the same grace of high priesthood and teaching, and accounted guardians of the church, we shall not suffer our eyes to sleep.'[3] This is commonly interpreted as a claim to be a bishop.

---

[1] *Wars,* III. iii. 5. [2] VI. XX. 2. [3] *De Vir. Ill.* LXI.

[4] Lightfoot, *St. Clement of Rome,* vol. i. p. 255.

We recognise the similarity of language in the prayer at the consecration of a bishop in the so-called *Egyptian Church Order*, which has been identified as the *Apostolic Tradition* of Hippolytus.[4] 'Now pour forth that virtue, which is from thee, of the principal Spirit, whom thou gavest to thy beloved Son Jesus Christ, which he gave to the holy apostles. . . . Grant, Father, Knower of the heart, to this thy servant, whom thou hast chosen to the episcopate to feed thy holy flock and to exhibit the high priesthood to thee . . . by the Spirit of the high priesthood to have power to forgive sins according to thy commandment.'[5] In the heading of the Arabic version of the so-called *Canons of Hippolytus* we read, 'Canons of the church with the precepts which Hippolytus, high bishop of Rome, wrote, according to the commands of the apostles.'[6] Towards the end we are told, 'Our brethren the bishops in their cities have laid down each and every thing according to the commands of the apostles our fathers; all of which by reason of the defect of our office we are not able to record.'[7] Though commonly regarded as a bishop, it is not until the *Chronicon Paschale* (*c.* 630) that we are told his see.

---

[1] De Rossi, *Insc. Christ. Urb. Rom.* ii. p. 82.

[2] *De Pass. S. Hipp.* 19–20.

[3] *Ref. Haer.* Pro.

[4] Ed. Connolly, p. 147.

[5] Hauler, p. 105.

[6] Haneberg, p. 63.

[7] § 252.

In this he is described as 'bishop of the place called Portus near Rome.'[1]

Our inquiry has brought out the true significance of Hippolytus's claim to high priesthood. We remember that the prophets and teachers at Antioch were acting as high priests (Acts xiii. 1–2). In the *Didache* similarly we read of the prophets and teachers, 'they are your high priests' (xiii. 3). In the epistle of Clement it is 'the leaders,' or 'the men on the roll,' who are compared with the Jewish high priest,[2] so we concluded. In each case the reference is to ministers of the highest rank, elders of the great church. The same, therefore, was true of Hippolytus. He was an elder, but an elder of the church of Rome, and consequently of the great church, the church of Rome being metropolitical. He was therefore a high priest, belonging to the highest order of the ministry, and whatever was the case in his lifetime, in later days he would have been regarded as a bishop, a title which certainly was his after his death.

The aged lady's instruction to Hermas in the *Shepherd* is, 'Thou shalt therefore write two little books, and shalt send one to Clement, and one to Grapte. Clement therefore shall send to the foreign cities, for to him it has been entrusted.'[3] Hippolytus seems to have occupied a similar position to Clement in the church of Rome. At the conclusion of the *Philosophumena* he addresses his readers, 'Such is the true doctrine concerning the divine, O men, both Greeks and barbarians, both Chaldeans and Assyrians, both Egyptians and Libyans, both Indians and Ethiopians, both Celts and Latins on foreign service, and all those who dwell in Europe and Asia and Libya, of whom I have become the counsellor.'[4] The suggestion is that, like Clement, Hippolytus had the oversight of foreign churches subject to Rome, and over them performed the office of a bishop. It would seem also that Gaius whom he opposed at Rome had held the same position. Photius says of him, ‘ This Gaius they say was an elder of the church in Rome in the days of Victor and Zephyrinus, the high priests, and he was appointed also bishop of the Gentiles.’ [1] Gaius we see was not only an elder of the church of Rome, but also at the same time a bishop. As he appears to have been a somewhat older man than Hippolytus he was perhaps the latter’s predecessor in the bishopric over the Gentiles. At any rate we have evidence that an elder of the church of Rome was a bishop, which confirms our contention that all, as elders of a metropolitical church, belonged to the highest order of ministers.

---

[1] Ed. Bonn, p. 12.

[2] §§ 1, 21, 40, 44.

[3] *Vis.* II. iv. 3.

[4] *Ref. Haer.* x. 34.

Further valuable information with regard to the early history of the ministry may be gained from a comparison of the documents already mentioned which bear the name of Hippolytus, the so-called *Egyptian Church Order* which is now commonly recognised as being the *Apostolic Tradition* of Hippolytus or an early recension of it, and the so-called *Canons of Hippolytus*, a later edition of the same original document.[2] In spite of many and important alterations, the close connexion of the two orders is still very apparent. It will be illuminating to set out in parallel columns corresponding sections, so far as they have to do with the question of the ministry :

Apostolic Tradition	*Canons*
Let a bishop be ordained, chosen by all the people.	Let a bishop be chosen by all the people.
	Let him be grave, as it is written in the Apostle concerning him.
And when he has been nominated and found acceptable by all, the people shall assemble, together with the presbytery and such bishops as shall be present, on the Lord’s day.	But in that week in which he is ordained, let the people say, We choose him.

---

[1] *Bibl.* xlviii.

[2] Connolly, p. 147.

Apostolic Tradition	*Canons*
All giving assent, let them lay their hands upon him, and let the presbytery stand by quietly. But let all keep silence	Then silence being made in the whole congregation, after giving their assent,
praying in their heart for the descent of the Spirit.	let all pray for him saying, O God, strengthen this man whom thou hast provided for us.
After which let one of the bishops present, at the request of all,	Then let one of the bishops and elders be chosen,
lay his hand upon him who is being ordained bishop	and let him lay his hand upon his head
and pray saying as follows, God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.[1]	and pray saying, O God the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.[2]
But when an elder is ordained, let the bishop lay his hand upon his head, the elders also joining in touching him,	But if an elder is ordained, let all things be done with him like as with a bishop, except that he may not sit on the throne.
and let him say according to the things said above, as we said above for a bishop, praying and saying, God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.[3]	Also let the same prayer be prayed over him entire as over a bishop, with the sole exception of mention of the episcopate. Let a bishop be in all things on an equality with an elder, except in respect of the throne and ordination, since the power of ordaining is not given to the latter.[4]
But let the deacon, when he is ordained, be chosen according to the things said above, the bishop alone likewise laying his hands upon him, as also we have said above.	If a deacon is ordained, let the appropriate canons be observed,

[1] Hauler, p. 103.

[2] §§ 7–11.

[3] Hauler, p. 108.

[4] §§ 30–32.

Apostolic Tradition	*Canons*
In ordaining a deacon let the bishop alone lay his hands upon him	and let this prayer be said over him,
for this reason, that he is not ordained to the priesthood,	and yet let it not pertain to the presbyterate
but to the service of the bishop, that he may do those things which are commanded by him;	but to the diaconate, as the servant of God. And let him serve the bishop
for he is not a sharer in counsel with the clergy,	and the elders in all things, and not only at the time of mass,
but performing duties	but let him also serve those of the people who are sick, whom no one attends,
and reporting to the bishop what is necessary; not receiving the common Spirit of the presbytery of which the elders are partakers,	let him inform the bishop that he may pray over them, and that there may be distributed to them the things which are needful for them, and likewise also to men weighed down with secret poverty.
but that which is entrusted to him under the power of the bishop.	And let them serve also others whom the bishops relieve, that they may be able to give to widows, orphans and the poor.
	In this way then let him perform all his duties. Such indeed is that deacon of whom Christ said, If any man serve me, him will my Father honour.
For which cause let the bishop alone make a deacon,	But let the bishop lay his hand upon him,
but upon an elder let the elders also lay their hands because of the common and like Spirit of clergy.	
For an elder has the power of this alone, that he may receive it; but he has not the power to give.	
Wherefore he does not ordain the clergy,	
But at the ordination of an elder he joins in the sealing, the bishop ordaining.	

Apostolic Tradition	*Canons*
But over a deacon let him say as follows, God, who hast created all things.[1]	and say this prayer over him, saying, O God, Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.[2]

We notice that a rubric which says that the ordination prayer for an elder is a repetition of that for a bishop, is common to both. As it appears in each of the versions of the *Order* which have survived, Latin, Ethiopic, Arabic and Saidic, it must belong to the original. If this be so, it seems to follow that at this point the *Canons of Hippolytus* represent the parent text more accurately than the *Apostolic Tradition*, which in spite of the rubric gives a different prayer for the ordination of an elder. It has been suggested that the rubric only requires the repetition of the first part of the bishop's prayer, the prayer for the elder as given being substituted for the latter part.[3] If this is the meaning, it is very misleading. It would not have been difficult to express such an intention plainly, as in a rubric of the Gregorian sacramentary.[4]

The compiler of the *Apostolic Constitutions*, who utilises the *Tradition* for his own purpose and gives a version of the prayer, did not so interpret the rubric, or at any rate he gives another beginning.[5] Such a combination would result in a very anomalous form. If the first petition of the bishop's prayer were included in the part repeated, there would be a prayer that the elder might receive the virtue of the principal Spirit which Jesus gave to the apostles, that is, the distinctive gift of the episcopate, which would contradict the rubrical statement that he receives only the common Spirit of the presbytery, that is the Spirit common to bishop and elder.

If only the first part of the bishop's prayer is supposed to be repeated, the sequence of thought, if not absolutely contradictory, would at any rate be rather curious, for a remembrance of God ‘ appointing princes and priests and leaving not his sanctuary without ministers ’ scarcely prepares us for a prayer that God will ‘ impart to him the Spirit of grace and counsel of the presbytery ’ as to the elders whom Moses chose. The bishop’s prayer is sacerdotal and the elders presbyteral, and the ideas do not blend. It seems very unlikely that so clumsy a combination could be intended originally. The probability is rather that the rubric means what it says, and that the prayer for the ordination of an elder was largely identical with that of a bishop. The rubrics suggest that an elder, though not a deacon, is ‘ ordained for priesthood,’ but the prayer given says nothing about this. Rather curiously a large part of the prayer is a prayer for the elders who join with the bishop in the laying on of hands, not for the person being ordained. Everything points to the view that it is a later insertion.

---

[1] Hauler, pp. 109–110.
[2] §§ 33–39.
[3] Turner, in *J.T.S.* xvi. pp. 542–547.
[4] Wilson, p. 143.
[5] VIII. xvi.

If we are correct in deciding that in the earliest text of the *Apostolic Tradition* the prayer for the ordination of a bishop was repeated at the ordination of an elder, it appears probable that the exception noted in the *Canons of Hippolytus*, ‘ with the sole exception of mention of the episcopate,’ is also original, for it seems improbable that the only difference was that several bishops joined in the laying on of hands for a bishop, but that elders only joined with the bishop in the laying on of hands for an elder. The references to the episcopate and the high priesthood are quite unsuitable for a local elder of a provincial church, and surely could never have been used for the ordination of such.

The order, if rightly regarded as the *Apostolic Tradition* of Hippolytus, originated in Rome, and in Rome the elders, so we have concluded, were elders of the great church, high priests or bishops, and at any rate in early days there were no elders of a subordinate kind. The appearance of prayers for the ordination of bishops and deacons only in the order agrees exactly with this conclusion. If elders of a lower order were a later introduction in Rome, we can understand the somewhat makeshift provision for their ordination, the original elders being in episcopal orders. Elders in the lower sense were evidently regarded as incomplete elders in the higher sense, lacking the power of ordination—'he does not ordain the clergy.' This view is stated quite explicitly in the *Canons of Hippolytus*, 'Let a bishop be in all things on an equality with an elder except in respect of the throne and ordination, since the power of ordaining is not given to the latter.' Jerome, we note, makes a statement to the same effect, and probably not altogether independently. 'What does a bishop do, ordination excepted, which an elder does not do?'[1]

In the *Canons of Hippolytus* at the ordination of a bishop we read, 'Then let one of the bishops and elders be chosen, and let him lay his hand upon his head.' Mention of both bishops and elders was perhaps suggested by words in the *Apostolic Tradition*, 'Let them [the bishops] lay their hands upon him, and let the presbytery stand by quietly,' but the difference is great, for now bishops and elders are identical. The phrase is in exact accord with Roman practice, for at Rome the bishop was commonly called an elder, as we see from Irenæus, while the elders, we have decided, were in episcopal orders, and therefore bishops. The direction that a bishop, and so an elder, also, is to be ordained by one bishop only, is also Roman, though not of very early date. A council at Rome in 386 decreed 'that one bishop shall not ordain a bishop,'[2] but to this in the sixth century Ferrandus in his *Breviarium* added the words 'except in the Roman church.'

In the church of Rome the elders, who were bishops, were accustomed to ordain, as the *Canons of Hippolytus* make clear. It was this fact perhaps which suggested the necessity of denying this right to other elders, both

[1] Ep. cxlvi. *Ad. Evang.* § 1.

[2] Cap. 6.

in the *Canons* and in their source, the *Apostolic Tradition.* In both documents there is also a similar denial of the priesthood to deacons. Arguing from analogy, are we to conclude that at Rome deacons were accustomed to perform certain sacerdotal functions ? We remember the account of the martyrdom of Sixtus (†258) by St. Ambrose, and the words of the deacon, St. Lawrence. 'And so he began to address him in these words : Whither dost thou go without thy son, father ? Whither, holy priest, dost thou hasten without thy deacon ? Never wert thou accustomed to offer sacrifice without a minister. What therefore has displeased thee in me, father ? Hast thou found me wanting ? Look to it surely whether thou choosest a suitable minister. To him to whom thou didst commit the consecration of the Lord's blood, to him to whom thou didst commit a share in consummating the sacraments, dost thou deny a share in thy blood ? '[1]

The language and ideas are similar to what we find in the *Apostolic Tradition,* where the deacon is ordained for ' the service of the bishop,' and receives ' that which is entrusted to him under the power of the bishop.' The word ' consecration ' has been a difficulty to many, and Baronius suggested ' dispensation ' as an emendation,[2] which was adopted by various editors. The change is entirely void of manuscript authority, and there is no reason to suppose it gives an accurate gloss. The administration of the chalice, though a common privilege of a deacon, cannot really be described as ' consecration.' The explanation must be sought in an examination of the duties of a deacon at mass at Rome in early days.

It is interesting to compare the parts taken by the pope and archdeacon in the consecration of the eucharist in a description of the celebration of mass found in a *Capitulare* contained in a St. Blasien manuscript,[3] which appears to be based on an earlier version of the order given in *Ordo* I. of Mabillon. We will set out the pertinent passages in parallel columns.

---

[1] *De Off. Cler.* i. 41.

[2] *Ann. Ecc.*, An. 261, n. 7.

[3] Gerbert, *Mon. Vet. Lit. Alem.* ii. pp. 169–170.

Then the pontiff, rising from his throne, also descends and receives the oblations from the people, both he and the bishops or elders.	But the archdeacon and the rest of the deacons receive the wine which is offered by the people.
The pontiff therefore, coming before the altar, receives the oblations belonging to the bishops, elders, or deacons, handed by those deacons, and he himself places them upon the altar. But the pontiff himself last of all, taking his own two oblations into his hands, lifting up his eyes and hands with them to heaven, prays to the Lord secretly, and the prayer being finished places them upon the altar.	But then the archdeacon, receiving the chalice from the subdeacon, places it near the oblations of the pontiff on the right side,
But the pontiff, when he has come to that verse that he says, By him and with him, lifts his own oblations from the altar and puts them in the mouth of the chalice . . . until he has said with a loud voice, For ever and ever.	the archdeacon holding the chalice.

The function of the archdeacon with respect to the chalice is almost the same as that of the pope with regard to the oblations. Did the parallel ever extend to the act of consecration? There is perhaps evidence for a division of the prayer. In the *Didascalia* a visiting bishop may apparently bless the cup alone. 'At the giving of thanks let him speak. But if . . . he is unwilling, at least let him speak over the cup.'[1]

The Roman canon has 'This is the chalice of my blood, of the new and eternal testament, the mystery of faith.' The addition, 'the mystery of faith,' is strange, forming no part of the gospel narrative and having no necessary eucharistic significance. It is absent apparently from the early version of the Roman canon used in North Italy, as found in *De Sacramentis*,[1] and indeed appears in no other rite but the Gallican, where it is included in the order attributed to St. Germanus,[2] its Roman origin there being apparent. The phrase is clearly derived from St. Paul's first epistle to Timothy: 'Deacons in like manner must be grave . . . holding the mystery of the faith in a pure conscience' (iii. 8–9). So the consecration of the chalice according to the Roman canon is described in words which in origin declare the duties of a deacon, the holding of the mystery of the faith. These presumably were interpreted as referring to the holding of the chalice by the deacon, in particular at the moment of consecration.

---

[1] Latin, xxix.; cf. Syriac, ii. 58; ed. Connolly, pp. 122–123.

Our Lord, we are told, at the last supper 'took a cup' (Mark xiv. 23). In the liturgies this action is commonly imitated by the priest as he recites the words of institution. There are rubrics which require it in the liturgies of St. James and St. Mark, Greek and Coptic.[3] In the liturgy of St. Clement in the *Apostolic Constitutions* the gospel words have been expanded and we are told that Jesus took bread 'into his holy and immaculate hands,' and the cup 'likewise,'[4] similar elaboration being very common in the liturgies. It is plain that high importance was attached to this manual act, and, rubrics being of late introduction, the suggestion is that long before any rubric prescribed it the action was always performed. In the Roman canon we read, 'taking also this excellent chalice into his holy and venerable hands.' Not only have we the common elaborate reference to our Lord's hands, but the chalice of the eucharist is identified with the chalice of the last supper. It cannot well be doubted that in early days, as certainly for centuries, our Lord's action in taking the cup was imitated by the priest who repeated His words for the consecration of the oblation.

---

[1] iv. 5, § 22.

[2] Martène, *De Ant. Ecc. Rit.* I. iv. p. 168.

[3] Brightman, *Eastern Liturgies*, pp. 52, 133, 177.

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 20.

Unfortunately there appears to be no early description of the Roman rite which gives any information on the point. Bernold of Constance (†1100) in the *Micrologus* speaks of it as traditional in his day, and his words, though late, may be quoted : ‘Then the bread is taken into the hands, and before it is replaced on the altar it is blessed : also the cup being elevated is blessed before it is set down. For the Lord Himself also in the gospel is said to have blessed each before He put it from His hands; for the things which He took in His hands He blessed, and afterwards gave to the disciples.’[1] Similar statements abound in later days, and in view of the evidence of the varying forms of the eucharistic prayer, we shall hardly be wrong in accounting the ceremony primitive.

There is an intimate connexion between the holding of the chalice and the consecration. If the Roman deacon held the chalice as the mystery of faith during the act of consecration, it can only have been because he also said the words of consecration. If this be so, the words of St. Lawrence to St. Sixtus rightly receive their literal meaning. We remember that an earlier Sixtus (*c.* 120), according to the *Liber Pontificalis*, ordered that within the action the people should sing the hymn *Sanctus*,[2] which likewise involves the delegation of part of the canon. Also, if the deacon recited part of the canon, the addition of the words, ‘the mystery of faith,’ has an adequate explanation, while the parallel between the functions of pope and archdeacon in the *Capitulare* of the St. Blasien manuscript is complete. In *Ordo* VI. the ceremony is very shortly described, ‘When the archdeacon with the bishop has lifted the chalice,’[3] but in later days, though the elevation still survived, the part taken by the archdeacon disappeared.

[1] xv.

[2] Duchesne, i. p. 128.

[3] Mabillon, *Mus. Ital.* ii. p. 75.

According to the Ethiopic version of the *Apostolic Tradition* of Hippolytus before the celebration of the Agape there is what may be regarded as a quasi-eucharist. There is a solemn participation of bread and wine before the meal proper commences. The bread is part of the *Eulogia*, 'the bread of blessing,' 'the delivered bread,' 'the bread which has been offered' at the offertory, and had thus been blessed by the bishop, though it was not needed for the consecration. The wine was apparently a special offering for the Agape, 'the mingled cup of the *Presphora*,' and in the original order would seem to have been blessed by the deacon, though the present text appears to be composite, directions for an alternative benediction by the bishop being intermingled. 'And afterwards the deacon, holding the mingled cup of the *Presphora*, shall say the psalm from that which is written, Hallelujah. . . . And likewise, the psalm having been completed, he shall give thanks over the cup, and shall give of the fragments to all the faithful.'[1] Again we notice the intimate connexion between the holding of the cup and its benediction.

Throughout the whole description the thought of the eucharist, to which various actions are parallel, is clearly in the mind of the writer. At the blessing of the lamp we are told, 'He shall not say, Lift up your hearts, because that shall be said at the oblation.'[2] With regard to the bread we read: 'Those who are the believers shall take a little bread from the hand of the bishop before they partake of their own bread, for it is *Eulogia* and not eucharist as the body of our Lord.'[3] So, too, of the cup: 'The deacon holding the mingled cup of the *Presphora* . . . he shall give thanks over the cup'; 'The bishop having offered the cup as is proper for the cup.'[4] The suggestion is that the whole action is an imitation of the action of the eucharist as celebrated at Rome when the order was compiled, and that the benediction of the bread was reserved to the bishop, though the hallowing of the cup could be performed by the deacon. The provincial deacon could thus imitate the function of the Roman deacon, but at a lower level, at the Agape instead of at the eucharist.

---

[1] Horner, pp. 160–161. [2] p. 160. [3] p. 161. [4] pp. 160–161.

The distinction in the method of benediction of the bread and cup at the Agape was evidently widespread, due in part, it would seem, to the popularity of the *Apostolic Tradition.* In Canon 25 of the council of Laodicea (*c.* 363) we read, 'Ministers [subdeacons] ought not to give the bread nor to bless the cup,' the duties prescribed for the deacon at the Agape in the *Apostolic Tradition*, and apparently in early days the prerogatives of a Roman deacon at the eucharist, as the story of St. Lawrence, and indeed the text of the canon even to-day suggest.

If this conclusion be allowed, the origin of the ceremonial at the end of the canon becomes apparent. According to the early Roman *Ordines*, when the pope celebrated mass a portion of an obley consecrated at a former mass, called the *Sancta*, was placed in the chalice after the consecration to signify that the eucharist is one whenever celebrated.[1] Similarly, when a priest celebrated in one of the titular churches of Rome a fragment of a host consecrated by the pope and sent to the church, the *Fermentum*, was put into the chalice to emphasise the unity of the eucharist by whomsoever celebrated.[2] For a similar reason it would seem when the pope had consecrated the oblations, but the archdeacon the chalice, the consecrated obleys of the pope were held in the chalice towards the end of the canon to testify the unity of the eucharistic act, in spite of the double consecration by pope and archdeacon.

For centuries the number of deacons at Rome was seven, as in certain other churches. According to the *Liber Pontificalis* Evarestus (*c.* 101–109) appointed seven deacons, while Fabian put them in charge of the regions of the city.[1] Cornelius in his letter to Fabius speaks of the seven deacons.[2] Sozomen in the middle of the fifth century says that the existence of only seven deacons was a peculiarity of the church of Rome.[3] The seven deacons of Rome regarded themselves, we are told by several writers, as the equals, even the superiors, of priests, or elders. Jerome writes: 'I am told that someone has been mad enough to put deacons before elders, that is, before bishops. For when the apostle clearly teaches that elders are the same as bishops, must not a mere server of tables and of widows be insane to set himself up arrogantly over men through whose prayers the body and blood of Christ are consecrated? . . . It is not the case that there is one church at Rome and another in all the world beside. . . . But you will say, How comes it then that at Rome an elder is only ordained on the recommendation of a deacon? To which I reply as follows, Why do you bring forward a custom which exists in one city only? Why do you oppose to the laws of the church a paltry exception which has given rise to arrogance and pride? The rarer anything is the more it is sought after. . . . Their fewness makes deacons persons of consequence, while elders are less thought of owing to their great numbers. But even in the church of Rome the deacons stand while the elders seat themselves, although bad habits have by degrees so far crept in that I have seen a deacon, in the absence of the bishop, seat himself among the elders and at social gatherings give the blessing in their presence. Those who act thus must learn that they are wrong and must give heed to the apostle's words, It is not reason that we should leave the word of God and serve tables. They must consider the reasons which led to the appointment of deacons at the beginning. They must read the Acts of the Apostles and bear in mind their true position.'[4]

---

[1] Mabillon, ii. p. 13.

[2] *Ibid.*, ii. p. 16.

---

[1] Duchesne, i. pp. 126, 148.

[2] Eusebius, VI. xliii. 11.

[3] *Ecc. Hist.* VII. xix.

[4] Ep. cxlvi., *Ad Evang.* §§ 1–2.

The special authority of the archdeacon, to whom presumably Jerome is referring, in the matter of ordination probably dates back to the time when only two orders of ministers existed at Rome. According to the *Apostolic Tradition* of Hippolytus [1] and the later *Canons* which bear his name,[2] the deacon is the servant of the bishop. In *Ordo* I. the archdeacon is called 'the vicar of the pontiff.' [3] In this capacity he has important duties not only at the ordination of an elder, but at the consecration of a bishop, as we read in *Ordo* VIII.[4] Jerome is evidently unaware of any historical and ecclesiastical reason for any pre-eminence of the ministers of the church of Rome. That a deacon should say grace at a feast is in accordance with early rules for the Agape according to the *Apostolic Tradition* and the canon of Laodicea.

The author of 'Questions on the Old and New Testament' speaks of the presumption of the deacons of the church of Rome in language very similar to that of St. Jerome. He, too, is unconscious of any ecclesiastical or traditional reason for it, and the only explanation considered is the secular greatness of the city of Rome. 'A certain man who has the name of Falcidius, the folly and boastfulness of the city of Rome being his guide, is striving to make levites equal to priests and deacons to elders. I will not say superior because . . . it may seem incredible. . . . By what law therefore, or by what custom, by what example he dares to advance this I think no one knows—that those to whom seats in church are never assigned he should make equal with those who because they are the priests of God have seats of dignity in the house of God and to the honour of Christ. What audacity is it to make their ministers equal to the elders? . . . Yet, although the deacons of the Roman church seem somewhat more shameless, they do not take to themselves the dignity of sitting in church; but the multitude of the clergy makes it that they do not perform all the duties of their service in order. . . . Yet so he defends the deacons against the elders, as though deacons were ordained from elders and not elders from deacons. But because they are the ministers of the Roman church they are for that reason considered more honourable than in the other churches, because of the greatness of the Roman city, which is regarded as the head of all cities. Accordingly, if this is so, ought they not also to make the claim for their priests, since if those who are inferior grow in importance because of the greatness of the city, how much more must those who are superior be lifted up?'[1]

---

[1] Hauler, p. 109.
[2] § 34.
[3] Mabillon, ii. p. 3.
[4] *Ibid.*, ii. p. 86.

That Rome was even in the earliest days a metropolitical church, the deacons ranking as the equals of local elders elsewhere, and performing some of their functions, even to taking part in the consecration of the eucharist, is unknown, as also that the elders of the Roman church were actually of higher rank than elders of other churches, being elders of the great church and therefore in episcopal orders, while elders of a lower order were of later introduction and consequently of uncertain position.

The lower grade of elders held an anomalous position at Rome for centuries. For a long period the popes were elected from the deacons, not from the elders, and there was no ordination of them to the intermediate order. Bishop and elder were regarded as alternative orders rather than as successive grades in the ministry. This appears to be the view of the Leonine sacramentary, for the same petition is used at the consecration of both bishops and elders, that God will bestow on them his 'sacerdotal grace.'[2] Possibly the sequence of the ordination services in this service book, for bishops, for deacons, and then for elders, is evidence that the last is a later addition, and an alternative rite.

---

[1] ci.

[2] Feltoe, pp. 119, 122.

Photius tells us that pope Cornelius ordained his archdeacon Novatus presbyter to prevent his succession to the papacy.[1] A letter of Gelasius shows how unpopular the lower order of priesthood was, for he suggests that subdeacons be ordained presbyters when deacons refuse.[2] The refusal is explained by the practice of ordaining only deacons bishops, which continued for centuries. One of the charges of Photius against the church of Rome as late as the end of the ninth century was that deacons were ordained bishop with no intermediate ordination to the presbyterate.[3] When Constantine was consecrated in opposition to Stephen III we are told of his ordination as clerk, subdeacon and deacon and then of his consecration as bishop, nothing being said of the priesthood.[4] So, too, Valentinus was archdeacon and Nicholas I deacon when elected to the papacy, and both were consecrated bishop without ordination to the intermediate order.[5]

In *Ordo* VIII. we read that a bishop may be chosen from the deacons or elders, but nothing is said of any additional rite in the former case.[6] In this *Ordo*, and also in *Ordo* IX., candidates for the priesthood are ordained both deacon and priest in the same service, the original intention being presumably to avoid the possibility of those ordained deacon refusing to proceed to the priesthood. This practice continued for centuries, long after its original purpose had disappeared. It explains why, when popes came to be consecrated from the priesthood, nothing is said in their biographies in the *Liber Pontificalis* of ordination to the diaconate, as we read of Leo III, Pascal I, Gregory IV, Sergius II, Leo IV, Benedict III, Adrian II, and Stephen V.[7]

All these abnormalities in ordination at Rome are to be explained as survivals from the days when only two orders of ministers existed in the church of Rome, elders who were elders of the great church and in episcopal orders, and deacons who were deacons of the great church and so the equals, if not the superiors, of lesser elders elsewhere. For many centuries, long after their origin was forgotten, the church of Rome continued traditions which had their beginning in the earliest days when the church was metropolitical in the original sense derived from Judaism. We remember that, according to our interpretation of the first epistle of St. Peter, the apostle claimed to exercise not only chief priestly but high priestly powers, and to have the right to wear the petalon.

---

[1] *Bibl.* clxxxii., cclxxx.

[2] Gratian. I, Dist. lxxiv. c. 9.

[3] Nicholas I, Ep. LXX.

[4] Duchesne, i. p. 469.

[5] Duchesne, ii. pp. 71, 151–152.

[6] Mabillon, ii. p. 88.

[7] Duchesne, ii. pp. 1, 52, 73, 86, 106, 140, 173, 191.

II.—ALEXANDRIA

There is a persistent tradition that the elders of another metropolitical church, Alexandria, in the earliest days, were in episcopal orders. St. Jerome says, 'At Alexandria from the time of Mark the evangelist until the episcopates of Heraclas and Dionysius the elders always named as bishop one of their own number chosen by themselves and set in a more exalted position, just as an army elects a general or as deacons appoint one of themselves whom they know to be diligent and call him archdeacon.' [1]

An echo of the same tradition is found among the *Apothegmata* of the Egyptian Fathers in a saying told of the abbot Poemen (*c.* 370). 'Once on a time there came certain heretics to Poemen and began to disparage the archbishop of Alexandria as having received his ordination at the hands of elders. The old man answered not a word, but he called his brother and said, Lay the table and give them dinner and send them off in peace.' [2]

The reference is presumably to Athanasius, of whom the statement is certainly not true, for we have a detailed account of his consecration by a number of bishops.[1] Yet it is evidence of the existence of a tradition of ordination by elders at Alexandria.

---

[1] Ep. CXLVI. *Ad. Evang.* § 1.

[2] *Texts and Studies*, vi. pt. i. p. 213.

Another witness is Severus, patriarch of Antioch, who in 518 was expelled and fled to Alexandria. 'The bishop also of the city, renowned for its orthodox faith, of the Alexandrians was in old times appointed by elders; but in modern times, in accordance with the canon which has prevailed everywhere, the solemn institution of their bishop is performed by bishops, and no one makes light of the accurate practice which prevails in the holy churches and recurs to the earlier condition of things, which has given way to the later clear and accurate, deliberate and spiritual injunctions.'[2]

We meet with the tradition again in a much embellished form in the 'Annals' of Eutychius, the Melchite patriarch of Alexandria (933–943). 'Mark the evangelist appointed, with Hananias the patriarch, twelve elders to be with the patriarch, so that when he died they should choose one of the twelve elders, and the other eleven should lay their hands on his head and bless him, and make him patriarch. Afterwards they should elect another eminent man and make him an elder with themselves in place of him who had been made patriarch, that they might always be twelve. And this custom of the twelve elders of Alexandria appointing the patriarch out of themselves continued till the time of the patriarch Alexander, who was of the 318 [at Nicæa]: he forbade the elders henceforth to appoint the patriarch, and ordered that when the patriarch was dead the bishops should assemble and ordain a patriarch. Thus ceased the ancient custom of the elders appointing the patriarch, and the power of appointing the patriarch came to belong to the bishops.'[3]

Many of the details are obviously apocryphal, and involve the reading back of later customs into the history of the earliest days. Yet the witness to the tradition that the elders appointed the bishop of Alexandria in the most primitive times cannot be ignored. There seems, indeed, no reason to doubt it. It agrees exactly with what we have learned about the church of Rome also in the earliest period, and is to be explained in the same way, that Alexandria was one of the original metropolitical churches, the elders being elders of the great church, and therefore in episcopal orders. Of St. Mark, too, it is recorded in a Passion of the evangelist that like Peter, James of Jerusalem and John, he wore the high priestly petalon.[1]

---

[1] In Athanasius, *Apol. c. Arian*, 6.

[2] *The Sixth Book of the Select Letters of Severus patriarch of Antioch*, Trans. i. p. 213. Ed. Brooks (Text and Translation Society).

[3] *Alex. Ecc. suae Orig.* P.G. cxi. 907 f.

III.—ANTIOCH

The thirteenth canon of the council of Ancyra (*c.* 315) has always presented difficulties to the interpreter, and many have been the emendations of its text in efforts to get rid of them. It should run apparently : 'That it be not allowed to country bishops to ordain elders or deacons, nor even to elders of a city, except by permission of the bishop in writing in each diocese.' We are commonly told that as it stands it is foolish, for, even if it were allowed that elders might ordain at that date, the suggestion that they had a better right to ordain than country bishops is absurd. Among the attempts to explain away the obvious meaning of the canon several may be noted. In the Isidorian version an addition at the end takes away the reference to ordination, and elders of the city are merely forbidden 'to order anything' without the authority of the bishop. In the Syriac the country bishops are forbidden to ordain elders or deacons in the country, or indeed 'elders in the city' without the permission of the bishop. Certain Greek manuscripts have boldly altered 'elders' to 'bishops,' so that it becomes an injunction to 'bishops of a city' not to ordain without the bishop's consent in another diocese.

---

[1] Volois, on Eusebius, *Ecc. Hist.* v. xxiv. 3.

A modern suggestion is that the word 'elders' is an interpolation, and is no part of the original canon,[1] the meaning being much the same as that of the manuscripts which read 'bishops,' this word being supplied from 'country-bishops' in the early part of the canon. It is regarded as an unanswerable argument against the reading 'bishops' that if this had been original it would never have been changed to 'elders,' but it is an argument equally unanswerable that, if neither 'elders' nor 'bishops' had stood in the original, so difficult a word as 'elders' would never have been supplied. The truth is that the explanation of the canon is not to be found by any conjectural emendation of the text.

The president of the council of Ancyra was Vitalis, bishop of Antioch, and the canon was evidently intended to apply to Antioch as well as to the country districts represented by the other bishops present. Antioch, we have seen reason to hold, was an ancient metropolitical church, and the elders were in episcopal orders, indeed bishops. Country bishops subordinate to city bishops had much in common with elders of a metropolitical church who were subordinate to the bishop of the metropolis. The need for restraining their activities in the matter of ordination would be equally insistent in the two cases, and it is evidently this common irregularity which the canon attempts to restrain. There is no necessary suggestion that all elders of a city have a right to ordain, but that this is true of some, the elders of Antioch and other metropolitical churches; yet important people as these were, much more important than mere country bishops, like them they must not presume to ordain elders or deacons save by the written permission of the bishop of each diocese. The final words 'in each diocese' are probably intended to refer more particularly to them, not to the country bishops, who would probably seldom wish to exercise their powers in another diocese. With important persons like the elders of Antioch, a metropolitical church with jurisdiction over other dioceses through a wide area, the case would be different. The purpose of the canon seems to admit of little doubt.

---

[1] Turner, in Gore, *The Church and the Ministry* (1919), pp. 329–330.

Confirmation of this interpretation is to be found in the history of Lucian of Antioch. Twice Eusebius speaks of him as an elder. 'Of the martyrs at Antioch the best in his entire life was Lucian, an elder of that community.'[1] 'Lucian, a most excellent man in every respect, of temperate life and well versed in sacred learning, an elder of the community at Antioch.'[2] Alexander, bishop of Alexandria, writing to Alexander, bishop of Constantinople, says of him: 'You, having been taught of God, are not ignorant that the teaching at variance with the religion of the church which has just arisen, is the same as that propagated by Ebion and Artemas, and rivals that of Paul of Samosata, the (bishop) at Antioch, who was excommunicated by a council of all the bishops, while Lucian, who succeeded him, remained out of communion with three bishops during a period of many years.'[3] Paul is not actually called 'bishop,' but a reference to the office must be understood, and it is only as bishop that he would have a successor. There is no succession of heresiarchs, and indeed from this point of view Lucian was a contemporary, or even a predecessor of Paul rather than a successor.

Eusebius tells us plainly that Paul had a considerable following among bishops and elders, and quotes the letter of the synod of Antioch against him to this effect.[4] That a rival ministry was set up by the Paulianists is beyond dispute, for as late as the council of Nicæa it was necessary to make rules with reference to the reception of their clergy into the church.[5] The objection to their orders was not that they had no valid bishops, but that errors in faith made their ordinations void. Antioch, the centre of the heresy, would hardly be without a Paulianist bishop, and particularly as Domnus, the Catholic successor of Paul, had been irregularly elected by the council which deposed Paul, and not by the church of Antioch and its elders. When Alexander then speaks of Paul's successor at Antioch, the reference must be to the person who had been elected the rival bishop by Paul's sympathisers among the elders in the church, who must therefore have been Lucian. The fact that we hear nothing of Lucian's consecration to the episcopate agrees exactly with the view that, as Antioch was a metropolitical church, the elders of Antioch were in episcopal orders, and so no further ordination would be necessary. For the same reason nothing would be said about degradation to a lower rank in the ministry on reconciliation to the church, for, if the elders of the church of Antioch were bishops, it would be unnecessary. What we are told of Lucian thus agrees exactly with our conclusion with regard to the metropolitical dignity of the church of Antioch and the episcopal orders of its elders.

---

[1] VIII. xiii. 2.

[2] IX. vi. 3.

[3] Theodoret, *Ecc. Hist.* i. 3.

[4] VII. xxx. 10.

[5] Can. xix.

According to Josephus Jerusalem was the metropolis of Judæa.[1] Speaking of Judæa he says: 'It is divided into eleven portions, over which Jerusalem, as the royal city, rules, presiding over all the neighbouring country, as the head over the body.'[2] The sanhedrin of Jerusalem had authority over the sanhedrins of other cities. What Jerusalem was to the church of the old covenant, the church of Jerusalem was to the church of the new covenant. As the elders of the great sanhedrin exercised jurisdiction over the elders of the local sanhedrins, so the elders of the great church, which in the earliest days was the church of Jerusalem, exercised authority over the local elders of provincial churches.

---

[1] *Wars*, II. xvi. 4.

[2] *Wars*, III. iii. 5.

At an early date, however, other churches were associated with that of Jerusalem as metropolitical, first of all Antioch, then Rome, and lastly, it would seem, Alexandria. Each was to the surrounding churches what Jerusalem had been to the cities of Judæa, and the elders of these churches had jurisdiction over the elders of other provincial churches, just as the elders of the great sanhedrin had jurisdiction over the elders of other cities of Judæa. On a Jewish model arose the episcopate in accordance with our Lord's own scheme, which was endued with life and power from on high at Pentecost. On the same Jewish model arose the great metropolitical churches, first of all Jerusalem, afterwards Antioch, Rome and Alexandria. This was the origin of their special position in the economy of the Christian church. When this fact is once grasped many difficulties in the early history of these churches disappear. Their pre-eminence was traditional as early as the council of Nicæa, and its origin already lost in antiquity. 'Let the ancient customs prevail, in Egypt, Libya and Pentapolis, that the bishop of Alexandria have jurisdiction over all these, since the like is customary for the bishop of Rome also ; and likewise in Antioch and the other provinces, let the churches retain their privileges. . . . Since custom and ancient tradition have prevailed that the bishop of Aelia should be honoured, let him, saving its due dignity to the metropolis, have the next place of honour.' [1]

The dignity of these four churches, Jerusalem, Antioch, Rome and Alexandria, as we have seen, is not merely ancient and traditional, but had its origin in an adaptation of the metropolitical status of Jerusalem under the old covenant to the purposes of the church of the new covenant, and is a natural development of the scheme for the organisation of the Christian church, which it was the great work of Jesus in the days of His flesh to establish.

---

[1] Can. VI. vii.

The council of Nicæa, we may note, likewise confirms the practice, also inherited from the Jewish church, that ordination should be performed by the laying on of the hands of three: 'It is by all means proper that a bishop should be appointed by all the bishops in the province; but should this be difficult, either on account of urgent necessity, or because of distance, three at least should meet together, and the suffrages of the absent bishops also being given and communicated in writing, then the ordination should take place.'[1]

---

[1] Can. iv.

EPILOGUE

Our investigation, though not exhaustive, has brought out with sufficient clearness the main facts with regard to the divers orders of ministers in the church of the old covenant and in that of the new. It has shewn in particular that the organisation of the Christian church was in its inception modelled on that of the Jewish church.

The ancient kingdom of God was proclaimed by Jehovah on mount Sinai, and inaugurated by the lawgiver Moses in the covenant sacrifice. In our Lord's time there was an elaborate organisation claiming continuity with the institution of Moses and his authority. We noticed the seventy elders of the great sanhedrin of Jerusalem, who were regarded as the successors of the seventy elders appointed by Moses in the wilderness, who had been partakers of his spirit—chief priests, doctors of the law, and other notables of the people—including an executive committee of twelve, the high priest being president; also assessors or ministers of the elders, the disciples of the wise, whose prototype was Joshua the attendant of Moses, and the local judges. In the provincial cities we saw a parallel organisation. We found a body of elders, originally seven, the seven principal men of the town, doctors of the law and others of importance, who were the local judges; also subordinate officers, rulers of the synagogue or almoners. Jerusalem was the metropolis of the ancient people of God, and the great council of Jerusalem was superior to and had authority over the councils of other cities, appointing the elders and ordaining them. The officers of lower rank in the higher court being practically on an equality with those of the higher grade in the lower courts, there were really three chief orders of ministers. The hierarchy therefore was: (1) elders of the great sanhedrin; (2) disciples of the wise or local judges; (3) rulers or almoners.

The organisation of the Christian church was at its inception exactly parallel to that of the Jewish church. Our Lord came to set up the new kingdom of God, which was to be not merely an idea but a world-wide society. He appointed a college of seventy elders, among them as a more intimate council the twelve apostles. He chose also younger men as ministers or attendants. Proclaimed the new Moses on the mount of transfiguration, Jesus inaugurated the kingdom in the sacrifice of the new covenant at the institution of the eucharist. On the day of Pentecost the elders and young men with the whole congregation of the people of God were endowed, each with his own particular gifts of the Spirit of Jesus, the new Moses. At first there were elders and deacons at Jerusalem only, but as the church increased and spread abroad elders and deacons were appointed in other churches, endowed with the appropriate gifts of the Spirit by the laying on of hands. As under the old covenant Jerusalem was the metropolis, and the elders and deacons of the local churches were subordinate to the church of Jerusalem, the great church, and were ordained by the elders of the dominant community.

At a later date, according to the evidence of various writers, we find other churches, as Antioch, Rome and Alexandria, sharing the metropolitical status of Jerusalem, and their elders accounted elders of the great church, their president, the predecessor of the later patriarch, being designated high priest in the earliest days, and wearing the petalon. There were thus as under the old covenant three chief orders of ministers:

(1) elders of the great church, including at first the apostles, the men on the roll, called also leaders, prophets and teachers ; (2) elders of the local churches, or bishops (in the lower sense); and (3) deacons, deacons of the great church being reckoned on an equality with elders of the local churches, and performing some at any rate of their functions, a fact which explains the long-standing rivalry between the regional deacons at Rome and the presbyters, as also other abnormalities in the ministry as found in that city.

On the arrival of the apostle John at Ephesus, though his influence in that region became supreme, and he presided over a college of elders, yet the church of that city did not become metropolitical. His elders were not a body of visiting overseers, as at Jerusalem and elsewhere, but localised leaders, the angels of the churches, the earliest examples of bishops in something like the later sense. A resident threefold ministry, as depicted in the epistles of Ignatius, originated thus apparently in Asia, afterwards becoming wellnigh universal. Yet in certain important churches, as at Corinth and Philippi, as we see in the epistles of Clement and Polycarp, there was no resident diocesan bishop for a considerable period ; indeed, the same is true in many places even to-day. The metropolitical churches retained their twofold ministry for varying lengths of time, their elders however being in episcopal orders, though only the president was normally called a bishop. The same was true also apparently of certain missionary churches, as in Gaul, according to Irenæus, where the elders were accounted as elders of the church of Rome, and so elders of the great church.

We have traced out the origin and early development of the several orders of the Christian ministry. What was originally, as under the old covenant, a double twofold ministry, of higher and lower authority, has become in practice the traditional threefold ministry of the church, bishops, priests and deacons. The words of the Preface to 'The form and manner of making, ordaining, and consecrating of bishops, priests, and deacons, according to the order of the Church of England,' in the Book of Common Prayer have been confirmed. 'It is evident unto all men diligently reading holy Scripture and ancient Authors, that from the Apostles' time there have been these Orders of Ministers in Christ's Church; Bishops, Priests, and Deacons.'

Printed in England at THE BALLANTYNE PRESS
SPOTTISWOODE, BALLANTYNE & CO. LTD.
Colchester, London & Eton.

Date Due

Ja 3 '40 DE 20 '50			
~~[illegible] 12 '60~~			
~~JUN 15 1973~~			

Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library
1 1012 01016 9896